United Nations S/PV.4271

Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

Provisional

4271st meeting

Friday, 2 February 2001, 3 p.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Ben Mustapha	(Tunisia)
Members:	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	China	Mr. Shen Guofang
	Colombia	Mr. Valdivieso
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Mali	Mr. Ouane
	Mauritius	Mr. Neewoor
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federaion	Mr. Lavrov
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchynski
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Briefing by His Excellency Major General Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

01-23767 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 3.10 p.m.

Expression of thanks to the retiring President

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of February, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute, on behalf of the Council, to His Excellency Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani, Permanent Representative of Singapore to the United Nations, for his service as President of the Security Council during the month of January 2001. I am sure that I speak for all members of the Council in expressing deep appreciation to Ambassador Mahbubani for the great diplomatic skill with which he presided over the Council last month.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo

Briefing by His Excellency Major General Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): In accordance with the understanding reached in the Council's prior consultations, I request the Chief of Protocol to escort His Excellency, Major General Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to a seat at the Council table.

Major General Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, was escorted to a seat at the Council table.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The members of the Security Council highly appreciate the initiative of President Joseph Kabila to meet with them at this stage of his first visit outside the Democratic Republic of the Congo since he assumed its presidency. The members of the Council attach great importance to this meeting and pin high hopes on its conclusions. We wish President Kabila every success in his noble mission to lead his people towards peace, security, stability and progress.

One year ago, on 24 January 2000, under the presidency of the United States, the Security Council convened an important meeting at which leaders of the States signatories of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement participated. On that occasion, the leaders reiterated their commitment to the Agreement. The meeting enjoyed the strong and broad support of the international community in general and of the Security Council in particular. The Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, which upholds the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, gave high hopes that the conflict in that country might be ended and the peace and security of the neighbouring States restored.

Since then, the Lusaka Agreement has gone through critical phases and faced many challenges. Foreign troops have not withdrawn from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the national dialogue has come to a standstill. The full deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) has been delayed. Throughout this time, the suffering of the people of the Congo has been perpetuated by the war.

The Council has followed with grave concern the developments in the situation and dispatched a mission of its members. The Council has adopted a number of resolutions and presidential statements. In this context, I would cite in particular resolution 1304 (2000), adopted on 16 June 2000 under the presidency of France in the wake of a meeting of the Security Council with the Political Committee of the Ceasefire Agreement.

The Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement remains the most appropriate framework for reaching a negotiated settlement of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Security Council expects all parties to the Agreement to demonstrate their commitment to the relevant Security Council resolutions and to the Agreement and to take concrete steps to move the peace process forward. In this regard, I pay a special tribute to the role played by the Organization of African Unity (OAU).

Last Friday's address by President Kabila to the Congolese people reiterated his support for the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and his resolve to pursue national dialogue and reconciliation. He underscored his commitment to cooperating with the OAU and the United Nations and to the deployment of MONUC; his demand that foreign troops withdraw from his

country's territory; and his desire to establish good-neighbourly relations with neighbouring countries.

The Security Council has consistently stressed the need for respect for the Democratic Republic of the Congo's sovereignty, territorial integrity and control over its natural resources. It is also concerned that the sovereignty of all States be equally respected. President Kabila will find the Council in full support of his contributions to moving the peace process forward. The Council's interest in the situation concerning the Democratic Republic of the Congo is reflected in the series of meetings which it intends to convene this month on that issue, in particular its meeting with the Political Committee of the Ceasefire Agreement. The members of the Council look forward to the achievement of concrete results at these meetings that will help to revive the peace process and assist the brotherly people of the Congo in fulfilling their aspirations.

I now invite the Secretary-General to address the Council.

The Secretary-General: We are meeting today to discuss once again one of the biggest challenges currently facing Africa and the United Nations — the challenge of bringing peace and stability to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and to the region around it.

Let me begin by welcoming President Joseph Kabila to the United Nations and congratulating him on his inauguration as Head of State of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I have already had the opportunity of extending to President Kabila my sincere condolences on the loss of his father.

The Lusaka Agreement, signed in July and August 1999 by six States and three rebel movements, has yet to be translated into action, but for the last two weeks the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) has reported almost no ceasefire violations throughout the country. This is surely a moment of opportunity, which must be seized by the parties and those who wish to help the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The time appears ripe for a resolute effort to implement the Lusaka Agreement, including through a genuine dialogue among all Congolese on the future of their country.

I welcome the calm that has descended on the confrontation lines between the various forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and hope that all the parties concerned, and all their military commanders, will take the necessary measures to ensure that it continues. Any regional initiative aimed at achieving this objective is to be commended.

In this regard, I urge the parties to adhere to the plan for the disengagement of forces they agreed to in Harare on 6 December. Within its current resources, MONUC has already begun to take the measures necessary to support the disengagement. In my forthcoming report to the Security Council, as requested in resolution 1332 (2000), I will propose the elements of a revised concept of operations for MONUC deployment in support of the disengagement plan. Once the Council has adopted the new concept, MONUC will take the necessary steps to carry it out.

Peace and stability will not return to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and its neighbours unless and until all Congolese are engaged in a meaningful dialogue to decide how their country is to be governed. By the same token, all countries of the region should continue to engage in dialogue to resolve this conflict. This requires the new Congolese authorities to confirm their strong commitment to peaceful negotiation, notably by taking steps to liberalize the political climate in the country. I am glad to note that the new Government is prepared to work with Sir Ketumile Masire, the neutral Facilitator appointed under the Lusaka Agreement, with the help of a co-Facilitator. I look forward to the early identification of such a co-Facilitator by the Congolese parties, with the help of the Organization of African Unity. Any support that can be provided by other heads of State in the subregion will surely also be welcome.

By its resolution 1304 (2000) of 16 June 2000, and reaffirmed in resolution 1332 (2000), the Security Council demanded the withdrawal of Ugandan and Rwandan forces from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, in conformity with the timetable of the Ceasefire Agreement and the Kampala disengagement plan of 8 April. I look forward to the early withdrawal of all foreign forces, as provided for by the Lusaka Agreement. In future phases of its operations, with the approval of the Security Council, MONUC will be ready to deploy to assist in this important objective.

The commitment to peace that President Joseph Kabila has already demonstrated is welcome for many reasons. Respect for the ceasefire could permit humanitarian agencies to gain access to populations in need. Greater attention can then be paid to human rights and the rights of children, including child soldiers, once the fighting has stopped. It would also be possible to address outbreaks of communal violence not directly related to the main conflict, such as those in Ituri and South Kivu.

Finally, it remains only for me to wish President Kabila every success. I am sure I speak for the international community as a whole in assuring him that he will enjoy our full support in his efforts to restore peace and promote democracy and development in his great country in the heart of Africa.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the Secretary-General for his statement.

It is my honour now to give the floor to His Excellency Major General Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

President Kabila (*spoke in French*): It is a great honour for me to speak here for the first time before the Security Council. The Government and the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo would like to thank the President, as well as the Council as a whole, for having involved us in today's discussion of the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Before continuing, I should like to extend my warmest congratulations to the President on his assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. My delegation is pleased to see the Security Council being led this month by the representative of a friendly country, Tunisia, as this principal organ of the United Nations responsible for the maintenance of international peace and security once again addresses the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

I should also like to offer my thanks to the Permanent Representative of Singapore for the new dynamism he was able to bring to the Security Council during his presidency of the Council last month.

Lastly, I would like to pay genuine tribute to a man who spares no effort in order to give significant impetus to our worldwide Organization and who deserves our greatest respect: Mr. Kofi Annan, the Secretary-General. My country owes him a great deal for the persistent and intensive efforts that he has made to promote the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations and, in particular, to bring peace to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

As I take the floor here for the first time in the Security Council, I remember the historic day, 24 January 2000, when President Laurent-Désiré Kabila, in this same Chamber, called for a withdrawal from our national territory of the armies of aggression of Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi, on the basis of Security Council resolution 1234 (1999) of 9 April 1999. A year after his speech, the situation has not changed despite the many efforts made. Indeed, on the contrary, the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has lasted for almost three years now, and the casualties have been extremely heavy. Some 1.7 million people died in 22 months in the occupied territory in the eastern part of our country, according to a report from the International Rescue Committee issued in May 2000. Today, that figure is clearly low, because it does not take into account the additional casualties that have occurred since May 2000 due to the continuing war of aggression since then.

The illegal exploitation of the natural resources of our country — primarily tantalite, coltan, timber, gold and diamonds — that finance the war effort of the aggressor countries is a devastating phenomenon, and it will have serious consequences for present and future generations in my country. An end must be put to this illegal exploitation.

My Government would like to assure the Security Council that it will do its utmost to cooperate fully with the Ad Hoc Expert Group, made up of eminent internationally recognized individuals of proven competence. We reiterate to them our fullest confidence and support.

It is our ardent hope that the panel of experts will submit to the Security Council in March a full report on the situation, which will enable the Council to take decisions on the basis of complete information. We would like the report to be a fair and equitable one that can establish the truth about the tragic plundering of the natural resources of our country.

My Government has often spoken to the Security Council of the very deep-seated yearning for peace felt by all sectors of the population of my country. This is why, given the challenges involved in the restoration of peace and the strengthening of national harmony in a

country that has been torn apart, I have decided on behalf of my people to work towards a policy that fosters dialogue and reconciliation.

I invite the authorities in Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi to return to a better sense of good-neighbourliness, with a view to achieving a peaceful settlement of differences and to cooperating fruitfully for progress in Africa.

Therefore, in accord with and in consultation with the allied countries that support us in facing the aggression, we are going to examine ways and means of relaunching the Lusaka Agreement so that it will not only lead to an effective ceasefire but will also restore peace to the Great Lakes region, while at the same time preserving the fundamental attributes of our Republic: independence, sovereignty, territorial integrity and unity, which the Council has continuously reconfirmed.

To be effective, the Lusaka Agreement must be reinforced by a binding mechanism that could set an example by punishing the parties that violate the ceasefire and do not respect the measures taken for deployment and disengagement. We ask the Security Council to consider during this month of February a new and precise timetable that would cover four points: the disengagement provided for in the Harare agreement, the deployment of United Nations troops, the unconditional withdrawal of uninvited forces and, finally, the withdrawal of troops from countries that were invited. To confirm the commitment of the Congolese Government to take an active part in this process, I would like to point out to the Council that my Minister for Foreign Affairs is present at this meeting.

As I said in my address to my nation on 26 January 2001, the problems linked to democratization must be resolved within the framework of the inter-Congolese dialogue. Accordingly, we reiterate our urgent appeal to all political players and members of civil society to join unreservedly in preparatory efforts to ensure the success of the dialogue, notably the continuing efforts to complete the Libreville process.

In my capacity as the person responsible for my country, I urge all of my Congolese brothers, regardless of their social origins, regardless of their views, and including those who have taken up arms, to come and sit down with us around a table to talk of peace and of how to organize the future political landscape in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to talk of the urgent need for our country to rebuild and to lay the foundations of sustainable development for the well-being of the Congolese people.

This is why, once again, I launch an urgent appeal to the international community to support the Congolese people as they move towards this dialogue, which must be among the Congolese people without any interference. For how can we not accept for ourselves what we undertook in support of our neighbour, Burundi, and what was unanimously supported in this Council? In that way, we demonstrated our nation's strong resolve to contribute not only to the return of peace to our own country but also to the peace of our neighbouring countries, and even more particularly of those that are occupying a large part of our national territory.

If a solution to the crisis in Burundi is indeed an indispensable and inseparable element of the crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, because of the consequences for our own territory of inter-ethnic conflict in that country, the same also applies to the need for democratization in Uganda and Rwanda. National consensus in all of our countries is a prerequisite for stabilization in the Great Lakes region.

In the course of this month, this Security Council is certainly going to take a decision on the possibility of phase II deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). We reiterate to the Council and to the entire world the commitment of my country to cooperate closely with MONUC so that it can effectively discharge its mandate, in particular as regards the urgent deployment of forces to Congolese territory in order to restore peace.

We would venture to believe that the Security Council will stand by its commitments, inter alia, by swiftly deploying its forces in accordance with the resolution I mentioned earlier and the subsidiary disengagement plan adopted recently at Harare, which provides for an initial deployment along the line of demarcation, followed by another deployment along the adjacent borders with Uganda and Rwanda, in order to provide security along our common borders.

We welcome the mutual understanding and close collaboration between MONUC and our Government, and we would like to convey to you our great appreciation for the quality of work done by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General,

Ambassador Kamel Morjane, who has enhanced the prestige of United Nations diplomacy. We encourage him to continue along the road that he has considered useful and necessary to restore lasting peace to our country. We are grateful to him, and we are sure that the Congolese people as a whole are also grateful to him.

By way of conclusion, may I say that my Government and I have given ourselves the task of continuing to rebuild our devastated country and to meet the expectations of our people. We want to bring together all Congolese, while respecting their differences, because it is the Congolese people as a whole we must serve in its diversity, as well as in its common love for the country. We must also respond to the people's deepest aspirations for a better quality of life.

Once peace has been regained and territorial integrity restored, our work will involve, with your assistance and that of the international community, preparing free and transparent elections so that the people can choose the person who will preside over the future of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

We are also among those who believe that the peaceful settlement of disputes and recognition of the inherent dignity of every member of the human family and of their equal rights are the basis of freedom, justice and peace in the world. This is the Congolese approach, which must, in my view, lead us to the restoration of peace in the Great Lakes region.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to thank His Excellency President Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, for his kind words addressed to me and to my country, Tunisia.

Mr. Cunningham (United States of America): Before I begin, I want publicly to recognize Tunisia's extraordinary contribution to the cause of peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In addition to personnel of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), Tunisia has dedicated three of its finest diplomats to this effort. I refer, of course, to the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Kamel Morjane, Assistant Secretary-General Hedi Annabi and you, Mr. President. We are deeply grateful to the Government of Tunisia for devoting so much of the coming month to the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and we pledge our full support and cooperation.

I join in welcoming President Kabila to the Security Council and to New York. We express to President Kabila, both in his official role and his private capacity, our deepest condolences for the death of his father and late President. We are deeply moved that in his time of grief, President Kabila has reassured the Congolese people and the international community of his commitment to moving ahead with the peace process. The eyes of the world were on President Kabila when he assumed his office. They followed him to Paris, Washington and now New York. Now is the time for bold and statesman-like steps on the part of all the parties, including the United Nations. We must all work together.

There are four important messages that we want to communicate to the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

First, whether in the field of peacekeeping, humanitarian relief or development, the United Nations is and will remain a friend of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Secondly, it gave us new hope when President Kabila's first words to the Congolese people and the international community were a renewed call for peace and democratization. We warmly welcome President Kabila's clear affirmation of his Government's commitment to the successful implementation of the peace process and his pledge to continue and intensify cooperation with MONUC.

Thirdly, we support the Lusaka process and urge all the signatories to ensure that peace finally comes to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the region.

Fourthly, and most importantly, now is the time for action. We want MONUC to deploy and peace to succeed. For this to happen we require an operational plan for the disengagement of forces and their redeployment, and the parties must create and sustain the conditions needed for further MONUC operations. This includes the provision of adequate assurances for the security and freedom of movement of United Nations and related personnel.

The Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has a right, under the United Nations Charter, to demand that uninvited foreign forces depart its territory. The Governments of Rwanda and Uganda

have a right, under the United Nations Charter, to demand that the Congolese territory not be used as a launching pad for attacks against their countries.

There is an obvious political settlement here. The Governments of the region need to work together, rather than against each other, to bring about what they and the entire region need: a stable and secure Democratic Republic of the Congo. The pursuit of common interests is the only means by which this crisis will be resolved.

While foreign Powers cannot dictate the internal politics of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, we believe that the call for democratization is not a foreign demand. The new political dispensation called for under the Lusaka Agreement is and must remain the sovereign domain of the Congolese people. As the Security Council delegation witnessed in Kinshasa, political parties, civil society, organizations and religious communities are calling for political participation and accountable governance in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. United States support for democratic development within the Congo is based on the belief that democracy and long-term stability are inseparable. We also believe that the best means to delegitimize armed opposition is to allow unarmed political opposition to flourish.

The Lusaka Agreement provides for an inter-Congolese dialogue under neutral facilitation. We hope for early progress in re-engaging the facilitation appointed by the Organization of African Unity (OAU), and we hope also that the dialogue can begin. We continue to believe that Sir Ketumile Masire is an outstanding former head of State who can fulfil his mandate, and we hope that he will reach out to the parties in the spirit of compromise and democracy for which his country is so well known.

It has been almost a year since the Security Council authorized phase II of the United Nations mission in the Congo. The Secretary-General delayed the deployment of additional United Nations personnel because conditions on the ground were not yet conducive to a successful mission. This was not a popular decision, but we believe that it was the right one, as neither the Lusaka Agreement nor the Council's resolutions had been implemented. If President Kabila's recent statements are followed by concrete actions by all the parties, the United Nations will, at last, be able to play its full role in the peace process, and my Government wants that to happen.

The critical short-term task remains a fully effective cease-fire and the disengagement of forces. While disengagement cannot substitute for a broader peace process, it will provide the enabling environment for progress on the political front. The Secretary-General is revising the concept of operations to reflect the changing situation on the ground. Just as we have supported his decision not to deploy additional personnel until the situation allows, we will support deployment as soon as conditions permit, and we look forward to his advice.

Pueto in Katanga province remains a potential flashpoint, but it also represents an opportunity for the parties to put the peace process on track. In this zone in recent months the cease-fire was violated. We welcome Rwanda's readiness to withdraw from Pueto, and we urge movement there as soon as possible.

President Kabila has created an opening for the peace process by his reaffirmation of the Lusaka Agreement, his offer to work with his neighbours on security issues and a pledge of full cooperation with MONUC. It is up to the other Lusaka signatories to respond with initiatives of their own.

Turning the Congo into a battleground of foreign armies inflicts misery on the Congolese people and adds to instability in the region. Rwanda and Uganda must present the Government of Kinshasa with credible, concrete actions that demonstrate that they are committed to peace, the withdrawal of their forces and the territorial sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo as a unified nation. All the State parties need to work together based on the mutual recognition that armed non-State actors using the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo pose a threat to regional stability. Whether we are discussing UNITA, the Front pour la défense de la democratie (FDD) or the Allied Democratic Front (ADF), the common denominator is that the Congolese people want them all to leave their country.

One group in particular, former members of the Rwandese Armed Forces (FAR) and Interahamwe, poses a major threat to regional stability and to the successful implementation of the Lusaka Agreement. Just as the international community is justified in calling for the withdrawal of Rwandan and Ugandan forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, so

too must we call on all the Lusaka signatories to abandon support for the ex-FAR and Interahamwe. In that way, the path will be open for the disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and resettlement of the ex-FAR and Interahamwe, as well as of other armed groups in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

At the end of the day, common security interests of all the States in the region converge, and those common interests can form the basis for peace. All involved have the responsibility to achieve the peace their people so clearly need and so justly deserve. We reiterate our call for the parties to go beyond statements and to use the coming days to take concrete steps needed to disengage their forces, bring about the conditions for further deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and begin the national dialogue called for in the Lusaka Accords.

My Government wishes President Kabila every success.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of the United States for the kind words he addressed to Tunisia and to its diplomatic representatives.

Mr. Levitte (France) (*spoke in French*): I wish at the outset to thank you, Mr. President, for having placed the Democratic Republic of the Congo at the heart of the Security Council's agenda for the month of February, during which you will be presiding over the work of the Council. I want also to thank the Secretary-General for the message of hope he has just conveyed to the Security Council: hope that peace will be restored in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

I thank President Joseph Kabila for his presence here today, and for the statement he has just made. On behalf of the French leadership, I extend our condolences to President Kabila on the tragic death of his father, President Laurent-Désiré Kabila. We believe that President Joseph Kabila's decision to come to New York to address the Security Council, only a few days after officially taking office, is particularly significant and encouraging. That gesture reflects a desire for true relations of trust and partnership between the United Nations and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and we hope that those relations will continue and deepen.

In his statement, President Joseph Kabila has just reaffirmed an approach based on dialogue and reconciliation, which we welcome. His inauguration statement before the Congolese nation had already laid the foundations for that. Further, President Kabila discussed this with President Chirac two days ago in Paris, and President Chirac indicated to President Kabila that he supported his avowals of peace and dialogue. We are particularly encouraged by President Joseph Kabila's commitments with respect to peace and to the restoration of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo through the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement and the relaunching of the inter-Congolese dialogue. Also encouraging is the President's wish to facilitate the deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), under the fine leadership of Ambassador Kamel Morjane, to whom we convey our greetings. The role of the international community here is resolutely to encourage and support the Congolese authorities on the path of peace and dialogue, while, of course, giving them time to build these new approaches. The international community must encourage the other signatories of the Lusaka Agreement to respond without delay to the overtures made by the new President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

My country's position on the resolution of the Congolese crisis was clearly reflected in the recent conclusions adopted by the Council of Ministers of the European Union. Here, my delegation wishes to recall several simple principles that should guide the implementation of the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

First, it is essential that all the parties implement their commitments under the Lusaka Agreement and that they respect the various resolutions of the Security Council. The withdrawal of foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, especially the withdrawal of uninvited forces, is imperative. Without such a withdrawal there can be no lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Secondly, as President Kabila has just forcefully said, the plundering of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo must cease. This ongoing violation of the sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo is unacceptable. Those who carry out such activities should in due course be

punished by the international community. France eagerly awaits the final report of the panel of experts on the illegal exploitation of the natural resources of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Thirdly, the withdrawal of foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo must be accompanied by rapid deployment of MONUC. MONUC observation of the disengagement and withdrawal of forces and the regular reports on this matter to be made to the Security Council will serve as a guarantee to the parties and will encourage them to carry out their commitments. All parties concerned must effectively ensure the safety, security and freedom of movement of MONUC personnel. France is also well aware of the security problems that could arise along the borders with some countries neighbouring the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We continue to support the principle of MONUC deployment in border areas, especially Goma and Bukavu.

Finally, the relaunching of national dialogue, in a framework that can undoubtedly be adjusted, should facilitate the solution of the specific political difficulties of the Congolese. As President Kabila has just said, the door to inter-Congolese dialogue must be open to all, without preconditions and without exclusion.

France encourages President Joseph Kabila to continue the constructive talks with Burundi that have been underway for some months — as he has just said he will. As President Kabila has just indicated, peace in the region must be comprehensive and lasting if it is to lead at last to the implementation of the policies of development, growth and democracy for which the peoples of the Great Lakes region long.

Today's gathering inaugurates a series of meetings which will include the visit here on 21 and 22 February, under your presidency, Sir, of the members of the Political Committee of the Lusaka Agreement. We must take the opportunity vigorously to relaunch the peace process and to hasten the settlement of a conflict that has caused all too much harm to civilian populations. It is in that spirit that France will work in the coming weeks — a period that we hope will be decisive.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of France for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): We convey very warm greetings to you, Sir, as you assume the presidency of the Council for the month of February. We are very pleased that you are leading the Council this month.

This is a special opportunity for the Security Council to welcome His Excellency President Joseph Kabila soon after his assumption of the presidency of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

It was encouraging to hear the commitment of the President to pursue the Lusaka peace process. We noted in particular his determination to make fresh efforts to bring peace to the country and to hold free and fair elections. His willingness to extend full cooperation to the United Nations observer mission, and his assurance to us of his support for the implementation of the resolutions of the Security Council, are very encouraging.

Today's meeting provides an opportunity to think together about a new departure in our common endeavour for peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Secretary-General has given us a perspective on the course of action ahead. We are in full agreement with him. We also appreciate the briefing on the situation that we received this morning from his able Special Representative, Ambassador Kamel Morjane.

It has been widely recognized that there can be no military solution to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is important that all concerned parties come to the same conclusion. According to our understanding, the Lusaka Agreement provides for a workable compromise for all parties. We urge the leadership in the region, as well as the rebel movements, to take a pragmatic approach to the peace process. In this context, we look forward to our meeting here next week with President Kagame of Rwanda. The insistence on finding a military solution or taking irreconcilable positions has not helped resolve the conflict. It has only increased the suffering of the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and their neighbours.

We understand that efforts are being made for a regional meeting, possibly at the summit level, involving all signatories of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement. For practical reasons, such a meeting should preferably be held prior to our meeting here with the Political Committee later this month. We shall

be expecting concrete steps from the Political Committee and the Joint Military Commission meetings this month.

In order for the Council to take a decision on full deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) at its authorized strength, we will certainly want to see some real progress on the ground. There have been arguments in favour of MONUC deployment as the forces withdraw, in order to prevent any security gap. For that to take place, the parties will have to demonstrate their commitment by effectively withdrawing as per the Kampala disengagement plan and the Harare subplan. We shall be guided by the advice of the Secretary-General with regard to the further deployment of the United Nations observers, assisted by the troops.

A fundamental element in the peace process is the inter-Congolese dialogue for national reconciliation. We shall call upon the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to revive the facilitation process at an early date.

Bangladesh particularly welcomes President Kabila's pledge to prepare free and transparent elections to enable the people to choose for themselves a leader to preside over the destiny of the country. The war of attrition in the Democratic Republic of the Congo has cost the lives of thousands of people; it continues to destroy the lives of thousands more; it has kept a whole nation hostage. The people of Congo have suffered some of the worst atrocities, and this must stop.

We call upon the leadership in the region to forget the acrimonious past and commit themselves to a future of mutual trust and confidence. It is time they took a decisive step to end the conflict. A peaceful, united and prosperous Democratic Republic of the Congo will be in the best interests of all the people of the region. The Security Council and the rest of the international community will stand behind them in their efforts. A courageous first step has to be made here. Today, with President Kabila's commitment to bringing peace to the Democratic Republic of the Congo, we have a window of opportunity. We should seize that opportunity in earnest.

Mr. Ouane (Mali) (*spoke in French*): I should like first of all to thank you, Mr. President, for having taken the initiative to convene this important public meeting of the Security Council to consider the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I should also like to welcome the participation in this meeting of Major General Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to whom I renew the heartfelt condolences of the people and the Government of Mali for the tragic death of President Laurent-Désiré Kabila. I should also like to thank President Kabila for the important statement that he made. Finally, I should like to welcome the Secretary-General to this meeting and thank him for the message of hope that he has just conveyed to us regarding the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

With regard to that situation, I should like, in the context of today's debate, to make several points.

First, Mali supports the search for a peaceful settlement to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In this regard, my delegation welcomes the renewed commitment of President Joseph Kabila to work for a solution that gives priority to dialogue and reconciliation. The continuation of the inter-Congolese dialogue and the Libreville process will, in the view of my delegation, be an effective means of achieving national reconciliation and arriving at a stable external environment. It is a fact that peace processes and reconciliation go hand in hand. That is why we support the appeal made to all political players, including civil society, and to neighbouring countries aimed at achieving a peaceful settlement of the conflict.

Secondly, we believe that it is of fundamental importance to create the conditions for a lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo on the basis of the full implementation of the Lusaka Agreement. In this context, we believe the relaunching of the Lusaka process to be a vital necessity. We encourage the authorities of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to consider the ways and means of relaunching the process in order to achieve an effective ceasefire and to contribute to the restoration of peace in the Great Lakes region.

In the same context, we welcome the efforts made by the Chairman-in-Office of the Organization of African Unity and by President Frederick Chiluba, who is presiding over the regional initiative, and we encourage them to persevere in their efforts.

Thirdly, my delegation believes that the rapid implementation of the second stage of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic

Republic of the Congo (MONUC) is essential for ensuring that the conflict in that country is resolved. In this connection, we support the appeal made to the signatories of the Lusaka Agreement to reaffirm their commitment to the implementation of that Agreement and comply with its provisions, particularly those relating to the implementation of the plan and the subplans for the redeployment of forces in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the deployment of MONUC. It is also important that Security Council resolution 1332 (2000) of December 2000 be fully implemented.

That is why we also look forward to the next report of the Secretary-General on the new concept of operations of MONUC. We also look forward to contributing usefully to the Security Council's meeting with the members of the Political Committee established under the Lusaka Agreement, scheduled to take place on 21 and 22 February.

In conclusion, I wish to stress that, given the gravity of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and all that is at stake, the international community must act speedily and practically. The Security Council in particular must shoulder all its responsibilities and firmly uphold the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Mali will do its full share in that necessary and urgent process.

Sir Jeremy Greenstock (United Kingdom): I warmly welcome you, Sir, to the Council chair and offer you my compliments for starting your presidency with this important meeting.

I congratulate President Joseph Kabila on his assumption of the presidency of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and offer my delegation's warm thanks to him for his extraordinary initiative in coming to New York so early in his presidency and seeking this meeting with the Council. I also renew the United Kingdom Government's and people's sincere condolences on the loss of his father.

The United Kingdom values highly the opportunity to have this discussion today. We must make the most of it to confirm our commitment at last to moving the peace process forward. The principles are all set out and were signed up to more than 18 months ago in the Lusaka Agreement. The Kampala and Harare disengagement plans have followed. We now need to see the solid, steady implementation of the peace process which has been missing for the past year or so. This means a strong focus on the Lusaka Agreement and we welcome President Kabila's clear reaffirmation of its importance today.

I think there are three key areas to address in the run-up to our meeting with the Political Committee on 21 and 22 February. On the military side, we welcome the general restraint shown by all the parties in recent days. This needs to be sustained and built upon. It is essential for the parties to be in contact and to get back to work on disengagement and withdrawal plans, mapping out achievable, concrete steps and setting a realistic timetable. They then need to take forward those plans. In this light, it is welcome news that President Kabila met yesterday in Washington with President Kagame and we would be most grateful if the President or his Foreign Minister could give us a summary account of that meeting or an assessment of its import. There can be no progress towards a political solution without direct communication between the opposing parties to the conflict.

This Council insists on a political solution to the conflict. A military solution is clearly unachievable, but the political track can only truly come alive if credible progress is made in creating a political framework that will give a voice to all Congolese people. If we all put the rights and wishes of the ordinary, peace-loving people of the Congo first, we will reach a solution to this conflict surprisingly quickly.

We wish therefore to see the early establishment of an open, inclusive dialogue, as set out in the Lusaka Agreement, that will allow the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to map out a new future for their country and suffer no longer the presence of foreign troops on their soil. We encourage the Congolese authorities to reengage with the facilitation appointed by the Organization of African Unity in taking this forward. I make a particular appeal to President Kabila to take the lead in this. He has the most important role to play, not just in moving forward dialogue among the Congolese people, but much more generally in creating an atmosphere that will allow truly open and representative dialogue to flourish.

In this respect, the United Kingdom very much welcomes the pledge in President Kabila's inaugural statement to restore normal democratic life in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, with full respect for human rights and justice, and to hold nationwide

elections. We call on all the Lusaka parties fully to respect human rights and humanitarian standards. It also might be useful to explore the scope for a multi-donor mission to assess the humanitarian situation across the Democratic Republic of the Congo, which would give us a much better understanding of the scale of the problem and the level and kind of assistance needed.

Then, there is the question of the United Nations role. I come to this thirdly because the way in which we can move forward depends first on the progress made by the parties. In December last year, we rolled over the mandate of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) for a further six months. We need to use this period to move forward. The United Nations has been in limbo for far too long, and the Secretary-General made it clear to us this afternoon that he wishes this to change.

But MONUC, so ably led by Ambassador Morjane and keen to carry forward its purpose, can deploy and carry out its role only in parallel with implementation by the parties to the peace process. The parties must give MONUC their full, practical cooperation. As host Government, the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has a particularly important role in this respect. Free access and security must be provided for MONUC, as well as for humanitarian agencies. We very much welcome the early positive indications from President Kabila in that respect. At the request of the Council, the Secretary-General will this month be reviewing the situation on the ground and the MONUC concept of operations. We want to move forward, but we can do so only when the Secretary-General is satisfied that the conditions are right and will allow us to play a useful role. This depends on forward movement by the parties and on clear evidence of support and protection from the Government and armed forces of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

We now have a programme and a clear opportunity for making real progress in implementation of the peace process, leading up to the Council's meeting on 21 and 22 February. Let us make the most of it. The United Kingdom will contribute forcefully to that objective. Let us hope that we will soon be applauding President Kabila for making the crucial difference in ensuring the success of that programme.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Ryan (Ireland): May I extend warmest congratulations to you, Sir, on Tunisia's assumption of the presidency of the Council.

In welcoming President Joseph Kabila to the Council today, may I also extend our condolences to him and to his family on the death of the late President Laurent Kabila.

We commend the initiative of President Kabila to engage with the international community at this potential turning point. We have studied carefully and welcomed his inaugural speech to the nation and we have heard his comprehensive address to the Council today. We welcome his clear commitment to bringing a strong impulse to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement so that it may lead not only to an effective ceasefire, but also to a restoration of peace and stability in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the region generally.

The meetings of President Kabila with Presidents Mbeki and Chirac, Secretary of State Powell, the United Nations Secretary-General and now the Security Council are evidence of his stated intention to contribute to the relaunching of the Lusaka Agreement and of his commitment to helping the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC) in carrying out its tasks. Yesterday's meeting with President Kagame was of particular importance and a most encouraging indication of the intention of both parties to respect the Agreement.

Out of the recent tragedy has come, we believe, a widely perceived opportunity to reach a peaceful settlement to this conflict. We have urged the parties to the conflict to engage in direct contact together in this regard. We reiterate that call today and we urge each party to take steps to engender the confidence of the other parties.

It is our absolute conviction that the Lusaka Agreement provides the consensual basis for peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and in the wider region. We urge all the parties to the conflict, and in particular the new authorities in Kinshasa, to seize this opportunity in a sustained process and to get together behind the Lusaka Agreement and to commit

themselves to its full implementation in letter and in spirit.

We welcome President Kabila's emphasis on this essential point in his remarks earlier. The Lusaka Agreement offers, by far, the best way forward. We strongly believe that no party to the Agreement should attempt to manipulate it in its own interest, but should honour strictly its obligations under it. All parties must move towards the national dialogue and reconciliation, as foreseen in the Lusaka Agreement, in order to form a freely elected, democratic Government that is representative of all the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We welcome President Kabila's stated commitment to solving political problems within the framework of the inter-Congolese dialogue.

We urge the authorities of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to make early contact with the facilitator with a view to making early progress on this issue. In this regard, we have noted Foreign Minister Okitundo's call for a co-Facilitator in the inter-Congolese dialogue as further evidence of the willingness to fully re-engage with the process. A permanent cessation of hostilities, the full withdrawal of foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the disarmament and demobilization of armed groups and the securing of international borders in accordance with the Lusaka Agreement and subsequent disengagement plans is an absolute priority now to be worked towards together by all involved parties.

We welcome the commitment of the authorities of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to collaborate closely with MONUC, as clearly stated by President Kabila in his inaugural statement and again here today, so as to enable it to discharge its mandate efficiently. We call on all the parties to move immediately to bring about the conditions in which the United Nations can assist and in which MONUC can effectively operate. We look forward to the next report of the Secretary-General, in which he will address the future shape of the United Nations presence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In this regard, we expect also that the United Nations operation will enjoy the full cooperation of all the parties involved. President Kabila has expressed today his own commitment in this regard.

The European Union has said, and we fully share the conviction, that lasting peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo will be possible only through a negotiated peace settlement that is fair to all parties, that respects the territorial integrity and national sovereignty of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, that upholds democratic principles and human rights and that takes account of the security interests of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and all other countries of the region.

President Kabila has committed to bringing about the normalization of democratic life, strengthening of the rule of law, consolidation of democracy and good governance and a guarantee of human rights and justice. We welcome these clear commitments, and we look forward to evidence of early progress. We also look forward to building on this meeting today and on this clear opportunity for peace at the meeting of the Political Committee later this month. We see the presence of President Kabila today as a signal of his commitment to this process, and we welcome this pragmatism.

We hope that President Kabila, having listened to the views of Council members, will return to Kinshasa with a clear understanding of the shared expectations of the international community and with a strengthened purpose to re-engage with the Lusaka process and to comply fully with the resolutions of this Council. The international community has repeatedly reaffirmed its commitment to help the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Once again, on our part, we reiterate our willingness to do so. Ireland and the Irish people have shown solidarity with the people of the Congo since long before that country won its independence. As an active participant in United Nations peacekeeping operations, Ireland shared the pain that accompanied Congo's birth as a nation. Ireland will now spare no effort within this Council in support of the process that will bring to the Congolese people the peace, development and tranquillity that they surely deserve and that their leaders can bring about.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Ireland for his kind words addressed to me.

Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I would like to kindly request the members of the Council to be as brief as possible in their statements so as to allow time for President Joseph Kabila to comment on the Council members' important statements if he wishes.

Mr. Shen Guofang (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): At the outset, I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this important meeting today.

We have noted that one of the priorities in the work of the Council this month is the question of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. This morning, Ambassador Morjane gave us a very important briefing. This afternoon, we are having this formal meeting. This is the beginning of a series of meetings on the question of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in the Council. We hope that all this input will advance the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

China warmly welcomes President Joseph Kabila to the Security Council for this useful dialogue and interaction with the members of the Council. We also welcome the important statement made by President Kabila just now. A few days after his assumption of the presidency, he has come to the Council to have this dialogue with us. This demonstrates his Government's sincere determination to advance the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

I would also like to take this opportunity to once again convey the sincere condolences of the Chinese Government and people to him for the loss of his father, the late President Kabila.

China is of the view that the peace process in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is now at a critical juncture and a potential turning point. At present, it is imperative to seize the opportunity to move the peace process forward so that progress can be made. China is happy to note that President Kabila has repeatedly emphasized his intention to implement the Lusaka Agreement and his commitment to the inter-Congolese dialogue so as to achieve national reconciliation. We highly appreciate this commitment by President Kabila. We are of the view that the inter-Congolese dialogue is of great significance.

The solution to the question of the Democratic Republic of the Congo is ultimately up to the people of that country. It is our hope that all the Congolese people will answer the call of President Kabila and will seize this opportunity to come back to the negotiating table to resolve their issues peacefully, free from outside interference.

China also is convinced that the United Nations and the Security Council have a positive role to play in a solution to the question of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and supports their playing that role. China hopes that we can make the most of this momentum and make timely political decisions.

China believes that the role of the United Nations, and that of the Security Council in particular, should be reflected in the support given to the sovereign Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in its efforts to restore peace there. Experience shows that we cannot afford to underestimate the difficulties that may occur along the road ahead. China is convinced that, in order to overcome those difficulties and constantly to push forward the peace process, the relentless efforts of all the parties, including the United Nations and the Security Council, are required. However, the political will of the parties to the conflict cannot be replaced by any other factors.

We look forward to all of the parties seizing the opportunity, to their taking a courageous step and building up mutual trust and confidence so as to create conditions for breaking the impasse and for the United Nations to play a role in this process. We hope that the Security Council will, in light of the changing situation, take specific steps for the deployment of the second phase of MONUC. This deployment should be based on considerations regarding the prevention of the outbreak of internal conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It should also be based on the effective guarantee of security along the borders between the Democratic Republic of the Congo and its neighbours. China supports regional organizations in their continued efforts. However, we hope that all of these efforts will be coordinated.

Before concluding, my delegation would like to reiterate that the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the Democratic Republic of the Congo must be fully respected and safeguarded. This is the prerequisite for a solution to the conflict in that country. It is also a principle with which all Member States of the United Nations should comply.

Mr. Valdivieso (Colombia) *(spoke in Spanish)*: Mr. President, I would like to say how pleased my delegation is at your assumption of the presidency of the Council, and I would like to reiterate to you our readiness to contribute to the successful fulfilment of your functions.

On this solemn occasion, I also wish to extend a cordial welcome to the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We regret the painful fact of the death of his father, former President Laurent Kabila, and we wish to convey words of comfort to his family and to the Congolese people as a whole.

The presence of President Joseph Kabila in the Security Council, and his statement at this meeting, are of great significance to peace in the world and give us grounds for hope. They reflect a clear commitment to peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo — a peace that we recognize to be the profound aspiration of 52 million Congolese, with whom we identify as members of the international community.

When we joined this Council, we promised the Members of the United Nations to work for the maintenance of international peace and security, and it is our intention to fulfil that promise. Therefore, we wish today to express a threefold purpose.

First we must work to ensure respect for the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as well as of all the neighbouring States in central Africa, as has been expressed by this Council on many occasions.

Secondly we must demand, as is our duty, of all the signatory parties of the Lusaka Peace Agreement that they fulfil their obligations. This means the demobilization of irregular forces, political dialogue leading to free elections, the withdrawal of foreign troops from Congolese territory and respect for human rights and international humanitarian law, among many other aspects.

The third component is to contribute to the prompt deployment of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo under guarantees of security for its personnel, freedom of movement and logistical support, which are indispensable for the conduct of its operations.

We hope that the expectations of the moment will generate an atmosphere of confidence that will make it possible for us successfully to hold the meeting scheduled for 21 February between the Security Council and the Political Committee composed of the signatories to the Lusaka Agreement.

Peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a commitment that this Council has to humankind. It is a commitment that we have assumed towards the Congolese people, the peoples of Africa and those of the entire world. We call for the reconciliation of the Congolese people with itself and with its neighbours, and we are prepared to contribute from this office to that goal.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Colombia for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Neewoor (Mauritius): Mr. President, allow me first to congratulate you warmly on your assumption of the presidency of the Council. We thank you for starting your presidency with this important meeting on the Democratic Republic of the Congo and also for placing that country and Africa high on the Council's work programme during the month of February.

My delegation joins the other members in extending a very warm welcome in the Security Council Chamber to His Excellency Mr. Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

First of all, on behalf of the Government of Mauritius, I wish to present to the President, the Government and the people of the Democratic Republic of Congo the sincere condolences of the Government and people of Mauritius on the tragic death of the President's father, the late President Laurent Kabila. We also wish to felicitate the Government and people of Congo for the courage they have demonstrated during the difficult time following the recent tragic event in Kinshasa and for the remarkable manner in which the transition is being managed.

We have listened very attentively to the important statement that President Joseph Kabila has just made before the Security Council, and we feel greatly reassured by it. We believe that he has the right vision to achieve the goal of peace and security within the framework of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of his country. The road to peace and security there requires, obviously, the participation of all the Congolese people in an inclusive political process. The Lusaka Accord that all the Congolese parties, as well as the non-Congolese parties involved in the conflict, signed in July 1999 remains unquestionably the foundation upon which peace and normalcy should be built in the Congo.

Unfortunately, so far the inter-Congolese dialogue, which is an essential and integral part of the Lusaka Accord, has not really got off the ground, and in a significant measure this has resulted in the stagnation of the Lusaka process. We are confident that President Kabila will do what is necessary for the inter-Congolese dialogue to begin without delay, in accordance with the provisions of the Lusaka Agreement. We urge all the parties to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement to recommit themselves to implementing this Agreement in all its aspects and to comply with all its provisions.

In the wake of the recent events in Kinshasa, the Security Council promptly received communications from Rwanda and Uganda to the effect that they did not intend to take any advantage of the situation. This has been very much appreciated.

We have no doubt about the commitments of both Rwanda and Uganda for the full and early implementation of the Lusaka Agreement. In this regard, we welcome the meeting earlier in Washington, D.C., between President Kagame and President Kabila. That bilateral meeting will help build confidence for the peace process. In the same vein, my delegation would like to urge Rwanda and Uganda, the two important neighbours of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to take steps to implement the disengagement plans which they signed in Harare a few weeks ago along with the other parties. This important step should mark the beginning of a process for the withdrawal of all foreign troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, pursuant to the Lusaka Agreement.

There is absolutely no question that the deployment of a United Nations peacekeeping operation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is necessary for the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement. Indeed, the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo have already been waiting far too long for the deployment to take place. There are certainly many reasons why the Lusaka process has not moved forward in the last year and a half since it was signed by all concerned parties. The undue delay in the deployment of the United Nations peacekeeping operation has undoubtedly contributed to the stagnation of the Lusaka process.

Today there are hopeful signs all around for the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement. President Joseph Kabila has stated his clear intention, both in Kinshasa and in his important statement today in the Security Council, to move the peace process forward. We also have assurances in this regard from the other capitals concerned. We have no doubt that all the Congolese parties will also rally in a spirit of patriotism and solidarity and will help bring peace and stability to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The inter-Congolese dialogue can ultimately determine the future political course of the country. The United Nations, for its part, must fulfil its responsibility and deploy the long-awaited peacekeeping operation without any further delay, in accordance with Security Council resolutions 1291 (2000) and 1332 (2000).

Before concluding, I wish to commend the Special Representative of the Secretary-General, Ambassador Kamel Morjane, and his small team of observers for their remarkable work in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I also wish to pay tribute to the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees, the International Committee of the Red Cross and the other relief organizations for their important humanitarian work in providing relief and assistance to numerous refugees, internally displaced persons and other victims of the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Finally, I wish to state that Mauritius wishes to President Joseph Kabila every success in his endeavours to bring peace, unity and democracy to his great country.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Mauritius for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Kuchynski (Ukraine) (*spoke in French*): Permit me at the outset to extend to you, Mr. President, my warmest congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I also wish to congratulate the members of your delegation, who assist you in your work as President. I assure you of the Ukrainian delegation's full support. I also wish to extend to your predecessor, Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani, my most sincere compliments on his excellent work during his term as President in January.

I also wish to join preceding speakers in welcoming Mr. Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and to thank him

for his statement, which is very useful in connection with the Council's consideration of the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, both internally and at the regional level.

On behalf of Ukraine, I also wish to extend sincere condolences to President Joseph Kabila and, through him, to all the Congolese people on the tragic death of his father, Laurent-Désiré Kabila.

(*spoke in English*)

The situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is one of the most sensitive and complex issues on the African continent. We note with satisfaction that, as the Secretary-General's Special Representative for the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mr. Morjane, indicated this morning, the situation in the country at this moment is more favourable than ever before, which we believe is due to the strenuous efforts of President Joseph Kabila. We welcome the relentless high-level diplomatic efforts; we take them as an indication that leaders of the countries of the region are willing to search for ways to advance the peace process.

We also welcome and support the willingness of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo — which was quite clearly expressed by President Joseph Kabila in his inaugural speech, as well as during his meetings in Paris and Washington and during his speech today at United Nations Headquarters — to move towards a peaceful settlement of the conflict on the basis of transparency, a constructive approach and comprehensive dialogue with all the parties concerned.

At the same time, we can see that not everything goes as planned and expected. In this connection, we would like to underline, among other elements, the importance of additional political steps by the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo aimed at promoting the inter-Congolese dialogue, which is, in our view, a key element in advancing the peace process in the country. To this end, it is necessary to intensify political negotiations between the Congolese parties — and this, quite obviously, is a very difficult task — in order to defuse the conflict. It is absolutely clear that a necessary precondition for this, or the necessary background, should be the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territory of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, as has been repeatedly called for in relevant Security Council resolutions.

We are convinced that the continued movement of the parties concerned towards the peaceful resolution of the conflict should, as before, be based on the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, as well as on the Kampala, Harare and Maputo arrangements, and that the language of arms cannot be a means of defusing the conflict.

We firmly believe that all parties to the conflict should continue constructive dialogue to that end and, within the framework of the documents, should take additional measures to accelerate the peace process. In our view, the activities of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo should be regarded as an impetus to that process. The parties concerned should do their best to facilitate its effective and comprehensive deployment, inter alia by fully implementing the provisions of the Status of Forces Agreement. I take this opportunity to reaffirm my country's readiness to contribute to United Nations peacekeeping efforts in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

It will be necessary, of course, to focus on solving quite a number of issues underlying the conflict that need to be addressed without delay. These include the withdrawal of foreign forces; the disarmament and demobilization of members of armed groups; ensuring the security of the borders between the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Rwanda, Uganda and Burundi; the safe return of refugees; inter-Congolese dialogue, as mentioned before; the restoration of the national and regional economy; and regional economic cooperation.

These and other issues pertaining to the implementation of the Lusaka Agreement will be discussed at the meeting of its signatories to be held on 21 and 22 February here in New York. We are certain that all these problems, difficult and complex as they are, can be resolved only through constructive dialogue among all parties to the conflict, one of which is the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Finally, I would like to wish President Joseph Kabila and his Government patience, tolerance, perseverance and every success along the bumpy road to peace and prosperity in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Ukraine for the kind and encouraging words he addressed to me and to my delegation.

Mr. Kolby (Norway): I congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency, and I thank Ambassador Mahbubani for his excellent presidency last month.

My delegation joins others in welcoming His Excellency President Joseph Kabila to this meeting. We commend him for his diplomatic initiatives and for his very important statement. We also would like to join others in expressing condolences to President Kabila on the tragic death of his father.

The Government of Norway supports the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement as the way forward towards a peaceful solution to the conflict in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. We note with great interest President Joseph Kabila's expressed desire to pursue a policy of reconciliation, and we urge the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to engage in constructive dialogue with all involved parties in accordance with the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, including through the rapid commencement of a constructive inter-Congolese dialogue. Full commitment to peaceful negotiations remains indispensable in the search for a lasting solution to the conflict in the war-torn country of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Against that background, we look forward to immediate and constructive initiatives from President Joseph Kabila that will re-energize the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, and we would also like to welcome his expressed intent to cooperate fully with the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). It is important to facilitate the full deployment of MONUC. Furthermore, all parties involved in the conflict must continue to exercise restraint and must comply with the provisions of relevant Security Council resolutions.

The implementation of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement must be based on full respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and on the legitimate security concerns of all parties, including States neighbouring the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Government of Norway emphasizes the need for the complete withdrawal of all foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo based on schedules drawn up by the United Nations, the Organization of African Unity and the Joint Military Commission; the disarmament and demobilization of armed groups; and the subsequent safe return of refugees and internally displaced persons. We urge all parties and ethnic and armed groups to cease acts of violence against civilians, to respect and protect human rights, and to ensure the safety and security of all international personnel.

Furthermore, the efforts to rebuild a peaceful and democratic Democratic Republic of the Congo must take due account of the ongoing illegal exploitation of natural resources and other forms of wealth in the country. We strongly urge the parties to the conflict to cooperate with the United Nations panel of experts established in that regard. The role of diamonds and other forms of resource wealth in fuelling conflict is well established, and any party's lack of cooperation with the expert panel will be viewed in that light.

A number of high-level meetings have taken place over the course of the past few months, indicating the willingness of leaders to support peace efforts in the Great Lakes region. My Government wholeheartedly supports such regional initiatives. Notwithstanding the responsibility of the Congolese Government and of Congolese leaders in generating democratic developments in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, the active and constructive involvement of African leaders is crucial for the achievement of comprehensive and sustainable peace in the region. My Government attaches great importance to the planned meeting between the Political Committee of the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and the Security Council, to be held in New York later this month. We urge the parties to explore thoroughly, through prior regional consultations, the political avenues that could be available for further consideration at that meeting. In that light, we note with interest the recent meeting in Washington between President Kabila and President Kagame.

The Government of Norway has supported financially the efforts to facilitate the process towards inter-Congolese dialogue, and we would consider doing so again if tangible progress were to emerge. Last year, Norway also allocated some $20 million to humanitarian and peace-building assistance to the Great Lakes region. Through our budget for 2001, a similar amount has been tentatively allocated with a

view to contributing to conflict resolution in the broader perspective of development.

In conclusion, let me compliment the work done so far, under the most difficult of circumstances, by the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Great Lakes region, Mr. Dinka; the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for the Democratic Republic of the Congo, Mr. Morjane; the MONUC Force Commander; military and civilian personnel; and other United Nations and international personnel, including those of non-governmental organizations, operating in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Norway for the kind words he addressed to me.

Miss Durrant (Jamaica): The Jamaican delegation is pleased, Sir, to see you presiding over the Council's deliberations for the month of February. We wish to assure you and the delegation of Tunisia of our full cooperation and support. Let me also express our appreciation to His Excellency Mr. Kishore Mahbubani and to the delegation of Singapore for the dynamic and effective manner in which the affairs of the Council were handled last month.

Let me join others in welcoming President Joseph Kabila to the Security Council. On behalf of the Government and the people of Jamaica, I wish to extend condolences to President Kabila and to his family on the untimely passing of his father, with whom the Security Council had the honour to meet in January of last year. Now that the mantle has passed to President Joseph Kabila, we assure him of my delegation's continued support for and solidarity with the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. Our message to President Kabila today is one of encouragement as he and the people he leads face the daunting challenges that lie ahead.

As the Secretary-General indicated, President Kabila may be assured that the international community stands ready to assist in bringing peace to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and to the entire Great Lakes region of Africa.

The fact that he has come to New York to meet with the Security Council so soon after his inauguration is a clear indication of his wish to move the process forward. We are indeed heartened by his recent diplomatic initiatives, both regional and international, and are encouraged by his call to all parties to come to the peace table. These gestures, reiterated in his important statement to the Council today, could be important confidence-building measures, which we hope will be reciprocated.

My delegation is well aware of how seemingly intractable the problems in the Democratic Republic of the Congo appear to be. But no matter how difficult it might seem to be to find solutions, the suffering of the people involved impels us to use our best efforts to put an end to their misery. My delegation continues to believe that the Lusaka Agreement remains the most viable basis for sustainable peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. In this connection, we support the call for an immediate cessation of hostilities and reaffirm our support for the unity, stability and territorial integrity of the Democratic Republic of the Congo in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the Charter of the Organization of African Unity (OAU). We also call on all concerned to demonstrate their commitment to implement the Kampala and Harare agreements, as well as to cooperate with the Libreville process.

Jamaica fully supports the pursuit of the inter-Congolese dialogue. We believe that this political dialogue is an indispensable step towards national reconciliation. We therefore welcome the commitment, stated here today by President Kabila, to resume the process of national dialogue, and we emphasize the need for full cooperation by all concerned with the office of the Facilitator.

We urge those who believe that they have a legitimate right to justice and to governance in the Democratic Republic of the Congo to pursue it through the processes provided for at the bargaining table and not through the barrel of a gun. We firmly believe that there is no military solution to the crisis in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Another issue of concern to my delegation is the continued illegal exploitation of mineral resources. The interim report of the panel of experts clearly indicates the link between the conflict and the exploitation of resources which should be used for the economic and social development of the people of the Congo. As the conflict widens, with some 16 million people being affected, including over 2 million internally displaced persons and refugees in neighbouring States, we have

the makings of an immense humanitarian tragedy, the extent of which is unknown, given the lack of access for humanitarian workers to the populations in need.

We realize, however, that the humanitarian and security situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo can be addressed in a lasting manner only within the framework of a comprehensive peace in a regional context involving the entire Great Lakes region. Jamaica therefore fully supports the holding of an international conference on the Great Lakes, in parallel with the national dialogue, under the auspices of the OAU and the United Nations.

In conclusion, my delegation wishes to express appreciation to the Secretary-General, to his Special Representative, Ambassador Kamel Morjane, and to the men and women of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo for their efforts to bring peace to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

We look forward to the report of the Secretary-General, which will set the stage for the Council's discussions later this month with the Political Committee of the Lusaka Agreement and for further action by the Security Council.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Jamaica for her kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Lavrov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): First of all, we should like to wish you, Sir, and your delegation, every success during your presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. We should also like to thank Ambassador Mahbubani of Singapore and his delegation for their work during Singapore's presidency last month.

I should like to welcome President Joseph Kabila, and I extend to him our condolences on the tragic death of his father, the late President Laurent-Désiré Kabila, one of those who was present at the beginning of the struggle for independence in Africa. The Russian Federation wishes President Kabila every success in his high office, which was entrusted to him by his compatriots at a very difficult and trying time for the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Russia's principled position in support of a political settlement in the Democratic Republic of the Congo on the basis of the Lusaka Agreement, as soon as possible, remains unchanged. In resolutions 1304 (2000) and 1332 (2000), the Security Council sent the parties to the Congolese conflict a clear signal about the need for an immediate cessation of hostilities, the withdrawal of foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the steady implementation of commitments undertaken under the Lusaka Agreement, without any backing away. Russia hopes that the very tragic events in the Democratic Republic of the Congo will not in any way jeopardize the hopes for a political settlement to the protracted Congolese crisis on the basis of the preservation of the territorial integrity of the country, in accordance with the Lusaka Agreement, subsequent agreements and Security Council resolutions.

We call on all the parties to the Congolese conflict to resist the temptation to take advantage of the present situation for their own ends. We believe that it is extremely important for all parties to cooperate fully with the United Nations Mission in implementing the Lusaka Agreement, the resolutions of the Security Council and the decisions of regional summits. We attach great importance to the actual launching of the Congolese national dialogue, with the participation of all political forces in the country, through international facilitation as provided for in the Lusaka Agreement.

We welcome the declaration by President Joseph Kabila that he is committed to the goal of national reconciliation. We call on all the parties to the conflict not to allow any violations of human rights or norms of international humanitarian law. We call on them to cooperate in the disarmament, demobilization, reintegration and repatriation of members of illegal armed groups with a view to establishing conditions of security for all countries of the subregion.

This month, there will be a review of how the parties to the conflict are implementing their commitments with regard to the ceasefire and disengagement. If the results of the review show that genuine political will exists on the part of the parties for implementing these tasks, that will certainly help the Security Council when it takes up the question of deploying phase II of the peacekeeping operation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of the Russian Federation for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Mahbubani (Singapore): Given the lateness of the hour, please allow me to quickly but warmly

congratulate you, Sir, on assuming the presidency of the Council, and to say that the Council is in very good hands this month. Like the delegation of the United States, we are delighted to see a powerful constellation of Tunisian diplomats in this Chamber today.

I should also like to warmly welcome President Joseph Kabila and thank him for his statement. I should also like to thank him and you, Mr. President, as well as all of our other colleagues, for the warm compliments they paid to Singapore for its presidency last month.

I should also like to convey my deepest condolences to President Kabila for the tragic death of the late President Laurent-Désiré Kabila.

Clearly, the issue of the Democratic Republic of the Congo remains one of the most complex and challenging crises facing the international community, and we have not heard much good news on this front.

The bad news is contained in my text. I will not read it out, but I do want to say that, despite all these setbacks, we believe that we now have a window of opportunity to relaunch the peace process. We hope that today's dialogue with President Kabila, under the presidency of Tunisia, will mark the start of a new process to bring peace to the Democratic Republic of the Congo and to bring peace to the region. Later this month, the Security Council will have another occasion to meet with the members of the Political Committee and to resume the useful and productive dialogue initiated last June under the presidency of France.

We are therefore encouraged to hear President Joseph Kabila say that the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo will extend its full cooperation to the United Nations. The United Nations, in turn, stands also ready to extend its full cooperation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo. But for this cooperation to take place, it is essential for the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to take several concrete steps.

Here again, the steps are spelled out in my text. I will not read them out, but I would like to emphasize the fifth point, in which we encourage President Kabila and his Government to cooperate fully with the neutral Facilitator in the inter-Congolese dialogue. The dialogue is a key element of the Lusaka Agreement, as indeed has been emphasized by so many speakers this afternoon, and we believe that, if successfully carried out, it can significantly change the political climate in the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

At the same time, the push for peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo must be part of a collective effort. MONUC's deployment remains contingent on the disengagement of all foreign troops. All the parties must adhere fully to the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement, as well as to the Kampala, Maputo and Harare disengagement sub-plans. We urge swift implementation of all Council resolutions, particularly resolutions 1304 (2000) and 1332 (2000). There can be no peace as long as foreign forces remain in the Democratic Republic of the Congo and we therefore strongly support the call made here a few minutes ago by the Secretary-General for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

The search for peace in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is also part of a wider goal — the search for peace and stability in the Great Lakes region. We would therefore encourage the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, under the stewardship of President Kabila, to continue the process of rapprochement with the Government of Burundi initiated by the late President Laurent Kabila at Libreville. Clearly, the future of the Democratic Republic of the Congo is linked to the peace and stability of the entire region.

In conclusion, the Democratic Republic of the Congo stands at a critical crossroads today. Let us not underestimate the enormous challenges that lie ahead. President Kabila not only has to contend with crippling colonial and cold-war legacies, but he must now also confront a complex political and military equation. He has undertaken the responsibility of leading the Government and the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo towards national reconciliation, peace, stability and development. We assure him of our full support in working towards a peaceful resolution of the conflict. The risks are great, but so are the rewards.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Singapore for his kind words addressed to me and to members of my delegation.

I shall now make a statement in my capacity as representative of Tunisia.

At the outset, I should like to express our condolences to President Kabila for the loss of his late father, Laurent-Désiré Kabila, one of the first African militants of freedom and dignity for his people and for the countries of Africa. Tunisia, which has made African issues a priority of its foreign policy, welcomes this opportunity to hear him speak before the Council and to exchange views on the present and future of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and the potential for peace, security and stability in the Great Lakes region.

As a member of the Security Council, Tunisia insists on the need to respect the sovereignty, territorial integrity, independence and control of the Democratic Republic of the Congo over its natural resources. The pillage of these resources, the property of the brotherly Congolese people, must stop. The people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo has suffered and continues to suffer under the scourge of war and its negative consequences. They look forward to a better future of peace, security, stability and prosperity, as well as to the solidarity and support of the international community.

Tunisia is resolved and happy to stand with President Kabila and the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo at this critical time in their history. We believe that there is no alternative to a peaceful settlement of the dispute in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement is the best framework, accepted by all parties, for fulfilling that objective.

Tunisia endorses and encourages any initiative or step of President Kabila towards dialogue and national reconciliation. We would also endorse any initiative he might take towards dialogue, reconciliation and cooperation with neighbouring States, within the framework of mutual respect by all States for their independence and territorial integrity. All parties have expressed their willingness to move towards peace. We look forward to all parties' taking practical steps towards that objective. We believe that conditions are ripe for a new momentum in the peace process in which all parties would participate through immediate action to implement relevant Security Council resolutions, the Lusaka Ceasefire Agreement and the deployment of the second phase of the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC).

We look forward to enabling MONUC to deploy as soon as possible, reflecting the intention of the international community to assume its responsibility for the situation in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The critical situation there and in the region calls for the firm resolve of the international community to help all parties to build a solid and lasting peace in the region, leading to prosperity, solidarity, stability, cooperation and development for the entire African continent.

In conclusion, I offer my best wishes to President Kabila as he leads the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo towards peace, security, stability and prosperity.

I now resume my functions as President of the Security Council.

I call on Major General Joseph Kabila, President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo, to respond, if he so wishes, to the comments of the members of the Security Council.

President Kabila: I should like first of all to thank all those who have expressed their condolences to me in person and, of course, to the people of the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I should also like to thank all those who have encouraged the Democratic Republic of the Congo to stay on track and to move on in the way that it has chosen — the way towards peace.

At the same time, I would like to remind the Security Council that its unwavering support is needed to accomplish this particular task in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I would also like to reaffirm the commitment of the Government of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and of myself as the President of the Democratic Republic of the Congo to seeing to it that we reach those objectives that we have set — the final objective being the democratization of the political life of the Democratic Republic of the Congo.

Nevertheless, it would be inappropriate if I do not add that this chain of events will come about only if the forces that invaded the Democratic Republic of the Congo are one way or the other forced to get out of it so that it regains its national territorial integrity. All the good words that have been expressed will not erase the fact that the Democratic Republic of the Congo is under foreign occupation — an unjust occupation in relation to all international laws — and that this occupation must end as soon as possible.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): Since I have no other speakers on my list, the Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

However, allow me at the end of this important meeting to express once again to His Excellency President Kabila the thanks of the members of the Security Council for his initiative of coming to meet with us and exchange views on the situation. The members of the Council have listened with great attention to President Kabila's important statement — a very clear message concerning his view of the future of the Democratic Republic of the Congo and ways and means of re-establishing peace and security in the Great Lakes region. The Security Council will be following this matter with a great deal of attention during the course of the month.

The meeting rose at 5.25 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4272

Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

Provisional

4272nd meeting

Monday, 5 February 2001, 10 a.m.

New York

President:	Mr. Ben Mustapha	(Tunisia)
Members:	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	China	Mr. Shen Guofang
	Colombia	Mr. Valdivieso
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Mali	Mr. Kassé
	Mauritius	Mr. Neewoor
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Gatilov
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchynski
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach

Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/82)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

01-23839 (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach

Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/82)

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Algeria, Argentina, Egypt, Guatemala, India, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Malaysia, Mongolia, Nepal, New Zealand, Nigeria, Romania, the Republic of Korea, Senegal and Sweden, in which they request to participate in the discussion on the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Baali (Algeria), Mr. Listre (Argentina), Mr. Aboulgheit (Egypt), Mr. Lavalle-Valdés (Guatemala), Mr. Pal (India), Mr. Nejad Hosseinian (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Akasaka (Japan), Mr. Hasmy (Malaysia), Mr. Enkhsaikhan (Mongolia), Mr. Charma (Nepal), Mr. MacKay (New Zealand), Mr. Mbanefo (Nigeria), Mr. Sun Joun-yung (Republic of Korea) Mr. Ducaru (Romania), Mr. Ka (Senegal) and Mr. Norström (Sweden) took the seats reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda. The Council is meeting in accordance with the understanding reached in its prior consultations.

Members of the Council have before them document S/2001/82, containing a letter dated 25 January 2001 from Tunisia, transmitting a working paper on the topic "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach".

I welcome the Secretary-General.

Today the Security Council is dealing with the subject "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach".

Together with conflict-prevention, the re-establishment of peace and peacekeeping, peace-building occupies a prominent position in the work of the Organization in the maintenance of international peace and security. Many discussions have taken place over the past 10 years, including consideration of the Secretary-General's report "An Agenda for Peace" and its supplement, issued in 1995, and other reports and statements by the Secretary-General, such as the important report he presented to the Millennium Summit, entitled "We the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the twenty-first century". Many important discussions have taken place in the Council, including those on the prevention of armed conflict and on the issue of exit strategies. Our meeting today is an extension of those discussions to examine and assess the various responsibilities of the Organization for achieving a joint vision and arriving at concrete proposals in the field of maintaining international peace and security in order to contribute to the implementation of the objectives set out by the Organization at the highest level, that is, at the Millennium Summit.

It gives me great pleasure to give the floor to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, to make a statement on the item under consideration.

The Secretary-General: It gives me great pleasure to join the Council today for this open debate on peace-building. I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for your initiative on this key aspect of international peace and security. I am confident that it will contribute to our efforts to arrive at a shared vision of peace-building with which all of us can move forward.

Peace-building in the broadest sense is about helping a country to put back in place the rudiments of normal life after a period of conflict. Peace-building is about the resumption of economic activity, the rejuvenation of institutions, the restoration of basic services, the reconstruction of clinics and schools, the revamping of public administration and the resolution of differences through dialogue, not violence. The overarching challenge is to move societies towards sustainable peace.

Peace-building done well is a powerful deterrent to violent conflict. But it is not powerful in the way an army can be powerful; rather, it is the sum of many initiatives, projects, activities and sensitivities. Peace-building is not the dramatic imposition of a grand plan; rather, it is the process of building the pillars of peace from the ground up, bit by bit.

The instruments of peace-building are as varied as the United Nations system itself. Indeed, virtually every part of the United Nations system, including the Bretton Woods institutions, is currently engaged in one form of peace-building or another. The disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants; human rights education; the repatriation of refugees; the promotion of conflict resolution and reconciliation techniques — this is just a short list of activities. We are also promoting cultural exchanges designed to link States in networks of enterprise and opportunity, not in webs of mutual antagonism.

In order to ensure the coherence of these efforts, we are also trying to improve our own internal arrangements, so that peace-building is not only comprehensive, but done in an integrated way. With an increasing number of United Nations entities establishing peace-building units and funds, we will need a major effort of coordination if we are to reinforce one another's efforts and avoid duplication and confusion.

We tend to think of peace-building as taking place primarily in post-conflict settings. Here, the goals are to consolidate peace, reinforce an often hard-won and fragile stability and, above all, to prevent a slide back into conflict. But I see peace-building also as a preventive instrument, which can address the underlying, root causes of conflict, and which can also be used before the actual outbreak of war. A society on the brink of breakdown is as much in need of such an instrument as one in which disaster has already struck. Its timely deployment at that stage could save many lives and avoid much misery. The political, economic and human logic of such an approach is impeccable. The problem is that we do not practise prevention as often as we could or should.

Whether started before, after or during the eruption of conflict, peace-building must be seen as a long-term exercise. At the same time, there is an unmistakable element of urgency — a need to achieve tangible progress on a number of fronts in a short period of time. Peace-building must be, above all, the work of the society that is threatened by conflict or that has succumbed to it. International efforts to promote peace or development must support, not supplant, national ones.

Peace-building is an extremely difficult undertaking. All too often, countries emerging from prolonged conflicts are starting almost from ground zero, under clouds of bitterness and loss. It requires persistence and vision, as well as the courage to pursue reconciliation in societies still fractured by suspicion and mistrust.

Here I would like to say a word about the fundamentally political character of peace-building, which makes it distinct from normal development activities in non-crisis situations. When a country is sliding into conflict, or emerging from war, its needs are qualitatively different from those of a stable society. This requires a reordering of normal developmental, humanitarian and other activities, so that their first objective is to contribute to the paramount goal of preventing the outbreak or recurrence of conflict.

Some have described this as looking at developmental and humanitarian work through a "conflict prevention lens". Others have spoken about "peace-friendly" adjustment programmes, with the flexibility to take account of the exceptional needs of countries emerging from or on the verge of conflict. Indeed, at times, peace-building may mean giving preferential treatment to some groups in a society in order to redress pre-existing inequalities that may have bred explosive tensions. This, in turn, may involve an allocation of resources that might not be optimal from a purely economic point of view.

During the last decade, both the General Assembly and the Security Council have recognized the importance of peace-building and the need to work with a range of partners, including non-governmental organizations and the private sector. The Council has rightly recognized that peace-building can be a vital component of peacekeeping missions, and that it needs to include such preventive tools as early warning, diplomacy, preventive deployment and disarmament.

In countries as diverse as Bosnia, Cambodia, El Salvador, Guatemala, Liberia and Mozambique, peace-building has helped to smooth the implementation and prevent the breakdown of peace agreements. In

countries like Haiti, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic, peace-building activities have contributed to the maintenance of fragile stability. In response to growing demand, the United Nations has opened, on a pilot basis, Peace-building Support Offices in the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia and Tajikistan.

Although these outposts are relatively new and are constrained by limited resources, they have helped Governments to destroy weapons, build institutions and mobilize international support for their societies' needs. As you know, we are now exploring the possibility of establishing a peace-building presence in Somalia.

This Council has a prime role to play. Among the major challenges of peace-building is the mobilization of sustained political will and resources on the part of the international community. A number of good ideas have been put forward in key areas such as the implementation of peace agreements and the design of peacekeeping operations, which the Council could incorporate into its future mandates.

Further contributions can be expected from our meeting with regional organizations tomorrow and Wednesday. I am delighted that the Presidents of the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council will be attending this event, and I am confident that the Council will want to lend its full support to the outcome.

Peace-building presents complex and diverse challenges. I will do my utmost operationally to improve the peace-building projects in which we engage and to exploit the best possible effect — the expertise that exists in the United Nations system and among many partners. But I will also ask the members to do more politically to give peace-building a higher priority and a higher profile by bringing it closer to the forefront of your awareness. Peace-building must not be seen as an add-on or an afterthought, something to save for later when conditions or resources or politics permit. It is a central tool of proven worth. Let us together pledge to develop and improve it, and then let us use it in good time.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the Secretary-General for his important statement.

Mr. Levitte (France)(*spoke in French*): I would like to thank you, Mr. President, for having organized this debate on a subject that is not at all theoretical. What is at stake is the success of actions carried out under the authority of the Security Council.

I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for attending this meeting today, in view of the decisive role that he brings to the Security Council.

Sweden will shortly make a statement on behalf of the European Union, to which the French delegation fully subscribes. I should like to comment on some points that are of particular interest to us.

The change in the nature of conflicts — for the most part these are now internal, even though many have a trans-border dimension — has compelled the United Nations to be concerned with peace-building. This task is indispensable if the gains from the re-establishment of peace are to be preserved.

The organic link between re-establishing peace and building peace has surfaced over the past few years in several ways. It can be in the inclusion of peace-building elements in the mandate of an operation in which the principal objective was peacekeeping, as in the case of the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic. It can arise because the mandate of the peacekeeping operation was more ambitious and included from the beginning an important component for restoring public authority and rebuilding social and economic infrastructures — for instance, in the case of the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia, the United Nations Transitional Administration for Eastern Slavonia, Baranja and Western Sirmium in Croatia, the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor. Lastly, it can be because offices or missions for peace-building programmes follow up on a peacekeeping operation, as is the case in Liberia, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau, Haiti and Tajikistan.

The problems of peace-building fall into two categories, our view: institutional and financial. Let us consider first the institutional problems. Peacekeeping operations are authorized by the Security Council, and they include elements of peace-building. But the Security Council is not competent to be the "project manager". On the other hand, the Council must ensure that there is no gap in continuity and that the investment of a peacekeeping operation is not wasted.

In addition, the multiplicity of actors involved in peace-building — the United Nations Secretariat, United Nations funds and programmes, international financial institutions and regional organizations — results in a variety of priorities and criteria defined and implemented by each of them. This very diversity complicates the task of formulating a peace-building strategy in a given country and of carrying out programmes built into these strategies.

Finally, in the country concerned, the natural interlocutor with the international community — with which peace-building strategies should be worked out — should in the first instance be the Government that has emerged from the peace agreement and often from subsequently organized elections. Yet in practice such authorities often lack the minimum of expertise and the requisite material and financial resources. In addition, their legitimacy and authority may be challenged by rebel groups that have remained outside the peace agreement or by parties to the agreement who violate their commitments — the case of UNITA in Angola and the RUF in Sierra Leone. In extreme cases such as East Timor and Kosovo the authorities simply do not exist or no longer exist, and the first task of the international community is to establish these authorities in a democratic way. The weakness of the local authorities often complicates the task of the international community in peace-building.

There are also financial problems. Peacekeeping actions in operations decided upon by the Security Council are financed by assessed mandatory contributions. Most of the peace-building operations, however, rely on voluntary contributions. It is contradictory to recognize the crucial nature of peace-building operations and not to ensure the steady and predictable financing that is required.

Because so many actors are involved in peace-building programmes and the means of financing differ, obtaining financial resources can be a rather slow and very unequal process. The slowness of financial institutions in disbursing money is often the crux of the problem that prevents a smooth transition from actions by peacekeeping operations to the intervention of organizations involved in peace-building. This slow pace also conflicts with the sense of urgency often perceived on the ground, namely that international intervention must quickly produce tangible improvements in the daily lives of populations, who will otherwise start turning against those operations.

The solution to these two problems should be to assess what is required for peace-building as far in advance as possible; to formulate strategies that will ensure the full participation, from the outset, of the relevant agencies, funds, programmes and banks that are involved in peace-building; and to speed up the pace of disbursement.

I will offer just two examples to better illustrate the difficulties confronting us. The first example is the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, commonly referred to as DDR. In a statement by its President on 23 March 2000, the Security Council noted that

> "the mandates of peacekeeping missions increasingly include oversight of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration as one of their functions"

because the task has proved to be one of the key aspects of peacekeeping. But the Council also underlined

> "the necessity of a clear definition of tasks and division of responsibilities among all actors involved in the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration process, including United Nations agencies and programmes". (S/PRST/2000/10)

The reintegration aspects of DDR are a perfect illustration of the difficulty of satisfactorily linking peacekeeping, peace-building and development assistance. There can in fact be no real demobilization, much less lasting demobilization, unless those who have been demobilized find a viable alternative to the status and life of the soldier. That means they have to be offered alternatives that fall broadly into two categories.

The first category is either integration into a reorganized, democratic and apolitical army, requiring in most cases the implementation of a programme to restructure the armed forces such as has been started in the Central African Republic, or something that is even more ambitious: the reconstitution of those forces, which is what is taking place in Sierra Leone now with the decisive support of our United Kingdom friends. Achieving these goals requires bilateral or multilateral programmes, often on a fairly large scale and extended in time. The second category is socio-professional integration into non-military areas, which requires action to provide job training and reconstruction

programmes to relaunch economic activity. Here, peace-building borders on development assistance in its broadest sense.

The second example is the reconstruction or consolidation of a reliable and impartial police force and judiciary. Peacekeeping operations play a key role in the phase following the signing of a peace agreement, but their purpose is not to continue indefinitely as the sole guarantee of public order. That is something that has to be founded on reliable and impartial local capabilities. So it becomes necessary to reform, reorganize and train police forces and courts. That has been part of the mandate of many operations and in some cases has been central to them, as for example in Haiti and in Bosnia. But often, it is a long-term undertaking exceeding the duration and resources of a peacekeeping operation. That is why it is essential, in association with the relevant agencies, to devise a long-term strategy to ensure stable, predictable funding for programmes of action and a gradual takeover of actions by the peacekeeping operation, as, for example, what was done in Eastern Slavonia or in Haiti.

It is clear that the Security Council plays a vital role in the satisfactory coordination of and transition between the tasks for which it has primary responsibility — re-establishing and maintaining peace — and those which bring into play a great many different actors: peace-building. Allow me to put forward a few practical proposals as to what we could do in this regard.

First, we would advocate early consultation between the Security Council and agencies responsible for peace-building. We believe it is essential for the main agencies involved in peace-building to be consulted as soon as possible at the start of the peacekeeping phase. Naturally, this would be done chiefly by the Secretary-General. The report (S/2000/809) of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations chaired by Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi made that quite clear. But it might also be necessary for the Council to contact those agencies directly, for example by inviting their heads to take part in the Council's deliberations, as was done when representatives of the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund were invited to take part in the Council's recent debates on Guinea-Bissau, the Central African Republic and East Timor. The main point is that this process of consultation should take place sufficiently early so that there is time to work out a peace-building strategy and to obtain the necessary resources.

The second idea is to establish a long-term contract between the international community and the authorities of a State emerging from conflict. Insofar as such authorities have the minimum requisite legitimacy and administrative resources, they should pledge to implement programmes, with the assistance of the international community, to rebuild political, economic and social infrastructures. The investment of the international community makes sense only if there is a corresponding real desire on the part of local actors for a fresh start. Such a contract could, for example, take the form of an exchange of letters between the Secretary-General and the head of State or Government of the State concerned, as has been the case with the Central African Republic. Mention of this could appear in the Security Council resolution authorizing the peacekeeping operation.

The third idea is to formulate peace-building strategies and obtain stable, predictable financing. The focus of early consultations between the Security Council and all the agencies involved in peace-building, and of the Secretary-General's coordination efforts, should be, with due respect for their respective powers and their decision-making autonomy, the formulation of peace-building strategies that: clearly define the responsibilities of each actor; ensure satisfactory cooperation among the various bodies; establish a timetable for the implementation of programmes; ensure, as far as possible, predictable financing, especially for missions relying on voluntary contributions; and provide for a transition between the peacekeeping and peace-building phases and a bridge between peacekeeping operations and peace-building programmes under the best conditions possible and within reasonable time frames.

Ideally, the division of roles and financing should be clearly defined at the time the Security Council establishes the peacekeeping operation and could even appear in an annex to the resolution. I stress this point because I feel it is fundamental. One can imagine the Council's holding consultations in parallel with potential troop contributors. Thus, from the very outset, the Security Council would establish a double partnership with the troop-contributing countries and with all the financial institutions — the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund and others —

entrusted with carrying out the Council's decisions. We feel that this point, too, is fundamental.

The fourth idea concerns strengthening the coordinating role of the Secretary-General and of his representative *in situ*. The point has been raised several times, specifically in the Brahimi report, that the Secretary-General has to play a greater role in coordination when strategies are being drafted and peace-building programmes implemented. The coordinating role should be assigned to the Secretary-General's representative *in situ*, when there is one.

The fifth and last idea concerns regular briefings for the Council. The Council should be kept regularly informed — as is already the case, for example, with the Central African Republic and Guinea-Bissau — of progress made and difficulties encountered in peace-building, since any failure or reversal in this domain would thrust peace and security concerns to the fore once again, starting with the Security Council's direct intervention.

These are a few ideas that we hope may be discussed in greater detail with all the Security Council members when we come to consider the practical effects of this debate. Forgive me for having spoken at such length, but we feel very strongly about this issue, which we consider to be critical.

Miss Durrant (Jamaica): Let me thank you, Sir, for convening this open debate, which allows members of the Council and non-members alike to express their views on the topic "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach", and for the working paper, which suggests points of departure for our discussion. We particularly welcome the fact that this debate precedes the Fourth United Nations/Regional Organizations High-level Meeting, which will discuss cooperation for peace-building.

My delegation wishes to express appreciation to the Secretary-General for his presence with us today and for his important statement.

Last July, the Security Council reviewed the complex dimensions of the causes and prevention of armed conflicts, recognizing the importance of peace building, particularly in post-conflict situations. In November, the Council established a doctrine on peace operations by adopting resolution 1327 (2000) after careful consideration of the Brahimi Panel's recommendations. At that time, we recognized the role of the Security Council in support of post-conflict peace-building. This was followed up with an examination of our exit strategies in peacekeeping operations, further recognizing the important role of the Security Council in peace-building. Today, as we seek to determine a comprehensive approach to bringing peace, security and stability to the peoples and regions of the world, we are, as it were, completing the circle.

In past debates, we have examined, to some degree, how the root causes of deadly conflicts ultimately manifest themselves in the outbreak of war, causing untold deaths, humanitarian suffering and economic destruction. We have seen from our experiences and our reviews of many conflict situations how many of these causes have remained unchanged in the aftermath of the bloodletting and destruction. We have seen how deadly conflicts have recurred, for the same reasons they started in the first place, after the warring parties have committed themselves to a peace process. We have learnt lessons on successes and failures, and this debate today must — as you have admonished us, Mr. President — point us towards a comprehensive approach to peace-building involving the organs of the United Nations, its funds, programmes and agencies, the international financial institutions and, equally, regional political and economic organizations and institutions as partners in an integrated, holistic approach to peace-building.

Let me make a few brief comments on the elements which my delegation considers indispensable to successful peace-building: where and when we should engage in peace-building; by whom it should be applied, and some of the instruments that might be successfully employed.

Through the failure to address the causes of deadly conflicts, situations of conflicts develop which might otherwise be preventable. While we often think of peace-building in the context of post-conflict situations, my delegation posits that peace-building can and must be employed in conflict prevention. Eradicating the causes of conflict necessitates building societies to respect the rules of law, adherence to international norms of human rights and humanitarian laws, and promoting economic and social development to eliminate human suffering from poverty and disease. These are among the challenges facing societies in pre- and post-conflict situations.

For these and many other reasons, the international community must view peace-building against this background. By being pro-active in dealing with conflicts rather than only responding to conflicts after they have occurred, the international community will have spared the lives and suffering of millions of people and the resources employed in reconstruction and rehabilitation of conflict-devastated societies could be channelled into meaningful programmes aimed at sustainable economic and social development.

While the United Nations and its partners pursue peacemaking in conflict situations, the dividends of peace must be clearly enunciated to the warring parties. These dividends naturally include the benefits to be derived by all parties in post-conflict peace-building. This underscores the importance of introducing peace-building strategies during the negotiating process and of imbedding peace-building programmes at the very outset in peace agreements. By so doing, we will be able to demonstrate to the warring parties the peace dividends that would inure to their benefit, which would provide further inducements for peaceful settlement of disputes.

We must consider how to ensure that our peace-building strategies have the greatest impact. Far too often, it appears that the international community favours a top-down approach to peace-building. With the exception of humanitarian assistance, the grass-roots population tends to have the peace-building process imposed upon them, often without regard to their indigenous structural and societal needs; in the process, the importance of civil society and the important role of grass-roots non-governmental organizations are often ignored. For this and other reasons, we must recognize that the process of peace-building does not end with the cessation of hostilities and the holding of elections when in fact the conditions for conflict remain intact. We have examples of this in Guinea-Bissau and the Central African Republic. While this step in the democratic process is an obviously important element in the reconstruction process and in the development of institutions of government, much more needs to be done over the long term. So often the international community appears to be willing to expend resources on peacekeeping, without an equal willingness to expend similar resources on peace-building.

As we seek to answer how peace-building may be effectively accomplished, we must clearly define the respective roles of the partners in this process. While their activities must be coordinated to avoid competing interests, waste and duplication, there is a need for full integration of programmes aimed at peace-building to ensure their effectiveness. The United Nations, through its organs, agencies and particularly its Secretary-General, has a central role to play in the process of coordination and integration. Of similar importance are the roles that regional institutions and organizations must have in peace-building, both at the pre- and post-conflict stages. These regional institutions and organizations must, however, be appropriately equipped and structured and adequately resourced to carry out their responsibilities. The meeting over the course of the next two days between the United Nations and regional organizations, convened by the Secretary-General, is therefore most timely, and we look forward to being briefed on the results of that meeting.

Let me conclude by highlighting some of the important and indispensable elements for successful peace-building to be undertaken by the international community as a whole. We must promote democratic governance and the rule of law by ensuring that our programmes develop respect for human rights, minority rights and peace with justice. We must ensure that the international community provides assistance to emerging democracies, in pre- and post-conflict situations, that promote long-term economic prosperity and social development. We must seek to strengthen the capacity of international financial and development agencies to focus attention on peace-building measures at all stages of a country's involvement in conflict. We must provide adequate resources to regional organizations and institutions so that they may become pro-active at the pre- and post-conflict stages in peace-building efforts and throughout the peace process. We must ensure that, when threatened from without, a nation is secure in the understanding that the international community will provide the necessary support for its security and territorial integrity.

We must also ensure that the programmes we design in a post-conflict situation make adequate provisions for disarming former combatants, for their rehabilitation and, most importantly, for their reintegration into society, politically, socially and economically. We must ensure that the exploitation of natural resources is to the benefit of the people as a

whole in the country concerned and does not support the corrupt within and without.

Finally, no matter how much we recognize what needs to be done to address each situation, if there is a lack of political will by those involved in the process and anything less than the full commitment of the international community, both of which are indispensable elements for successful peace-building, our efforts will be for naught. If we bring all of these things together in an integrated approach to peace-building, the successes which have eluded us in the past will finally be achieved.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: Before giving the floor to the next speaker, I should like to inform the Council that I have just received a letter from the representative of Croatia, in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Šimonović (Croatia) took the seat reserved for him at the side of the Council Chamber.

Mr. Cunningham (United States of America): I wish to congratulate you, Mr. President, for refocusing the attention of the Council on this important issue and for your concept paper, from which we can launch a substantive discussion. I also want to thank the Secretary-General for being with us today, and for his overview and his continuing efforts to integrate peacekeeping and peace-building.

Peace-building is a multifaceted challenge. In our view, strengthening the rule of law in democratic institutions and promoting human rights are vital to effective peace-building. Peace-building measures can also include food and medical assistance, the use of civilian police, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, successful repatriation of refugees and the reconstruction and restoration of economic institutions and processes. All of these elements are critical in moving a post-conflict State towards lasting stability.

These needs can be met through a variety of bilateral and multilateral means. For instance, the United States supports the efforts of the United Nations and those of all States and regional organizations to foster sustainable stability around the globe. We are actively engaged in and support preventive measures — measures that identify causes of conflict and address them before they evolve into violence. Development assistance remains an important part of United States foreign policy, and we believe that the United States role in peacekeeping operations, as well as in post-conflict peace-building, is critical. We do all of this in our daily diplomatic engagement worldwide through a variety of mechanisms and in the application of the full range of our assistance resources.

In addition, while it is certainly true that conflicts have underlying structural causes, we must not forget that their immediate causes are often individual ambition and greed. Some of the most intractable conflicts of recent years have taken place not in the poorest countries but in places that are rich in resources. Peace-building activities must therefore also deal with political realities and attempt to address them.

The movement of a post-conflict State towards sustainable peace is not a linear progression. It is inherently complex. Peace-building measures must be taken even as peacekeeping mechanisms are put into place. This is not to say, however, that it is the responsibility of the Security Council to direct the multiple United Nations agencies that must be involved in peace-building. It is to say that the Security Council must be aware when it formulates mandates that peacekeeping without peace-building is a recipe for potential waste. Indeed, in many cases, effective peace-building must be created to ensure a viable exit strategy for peacekeepers.

In the past, the Council has agreed that certain peace-building measures fall within its purview. Examples of this include disarmament, demobilization and reintegration activities and the rebuilding of indigenous police forces. These efforts have proved to facilitate the effective implementation of peacekeeping operations. We should explore similar measures wherever and whenever appropriate.

In this connection, I note that during the Brahimi debates the United States strongly supported increasing the capacity of the United Nations to field effective

civilian police forces. Regardless of mission, United Nations civil police assist local police agencies in resuming as rapidly as possible full responsibility for the law-and-order tasks performed by United Nations peacekeepers. The Brahimi-proposed judicial unit would also greatly assist in this regard. We do not believe, though, that a Security Council mandate should focus on reconstruction and development. This is not the responsibility of the Security Council.

But we need to ask ourselves, "What is the role of the Security Council in peace-building?" All elements of the United Nations system need to work together, and regional organizations, international financial institutions, donor Governments and non-governmental organizations all have roles. It is absolutely clear that better coordination is certainly needed. That is why this debate is critical. The Security Council should be clear and should encourage, and even insist on, clarity on this issue. Otherwise, the full potential of even the best-conceived Security Council action will not be realized.

We need to ask who should direct peace-building initiatives. Should there be one lead agency or organ, or more than one? What kinds of bridges need to be constructed between the various departments of the Secretariat and agencies of the wider United Nations community? Finally, and as recommended in the Brahimi report, where in the Secretariat do we place a peace-building unit? In the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, the Department of Political Affairs or the Office of the Secretary-General? We need to make these decisions in order to put peace-building on the right track right away.

In conclusion, we encourage all United Nations agencies, as well as all Member States, to support the Secretary-General's efforts to enhance the United Nations peace-building activities and to strengthen coordination. We support proposals for maximum consultation and exchange of information so that in all instances this Council and all the other actors involved have the best possible understanding of the situation on the ground, of the steps all actors are taking in their own competence and of the relationship of all those steps to an overall strategy for creating and building long-term peace and security.

Sir Jeremy Greenstock (United Kingdom): I am heartened by the Secretary-General's decision to call a high-level meeting with the regional organizations on building a comprehensive approach to peace-building, and it is an excellent idea to have the Security Council and Member States feed their views into that meeting. So thank you, Mr. President, for the initiative and the preparation by your delegation.

The representative of Sweden will make a statement later in our debate on behalf of the European Union, and the United Kingdom fully subscribes to that statement. But I would like to make some points in my national capacity.

I have been arguing for some time that the United Nations should take a more integrated approach to tackling conflicts at their roots and in a coordinated way. The Secretary-General has set out his views clearly this morning, and I support his approach. But the task goes beyond the ability of the Security Council or the Organization as a whole. The entire international system has to improve its professionalism if we are to make a difference. Bilateral actors, United Nations agencies, the Council and the General Assembly will all have to play their part.

At the meeting tomorrow decisions will be needed on how the regional organizations can develop their key role. Cooperation should start with the essential business of sharing information and analysis. The capacity of regional organizations could be extended by the double-hatting of special envoys, exchanges of staff with the Secretariat and the arrangement of specialist training and secondments. I hope the high-level meeting will consider the full range of options.

In making the paradigm shift to a more integrated approach among the international institutions, we have to accept that the distinction so frequently drawn in recent months between development and security is a false one. Conflict and poverty feed off each other; so must conflict management and development. We need comprehensive and integrated policies that recognize the links between resolving conflict, building peace, reducing poverty, promoting education and improving health.

The Secretary-General is right to point to a distinction between developmental activities in the shadow of conflict and normal development work. We must consider this in greater detail. In the same context, I warmly welcome his decision to appoint a deputy special representative in Sierra Leone both to oversee the economic and social aspects of the

peacekeeping programme, including disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, and to act as the United Nations Resident Coordinator.

So how do we put this new approach to work?

The first task is to deepen our analysis. Our means of identifying and responding to crises tend to be superficial and haphazard. Analysis must stretch beyond the immediate conflict into its roots. This was why the Brahimi report's proposal for an Information and Strategic Analysis Secretariat (EISAS) is in principle right. It would allow a range of skills available within the United Nations system to be brought together under one roof, providing exactly the sort of comprehensive analyses that this Council and the Secretary-General so badly need. We should use the coming months to put in place a properly thought-through structure to achieve this, with a logic and a resource cost which can win the support of all. The countries or regions themselves affected by conflict must be brought into the process. African leaders, for instance, are beginning to indicate how strong their interest is in a fully coordinated approach.

Second, the integrated approach must apply to the critical work of the United Nations agencies and their partner organizations in the field. The background documentation for the high-level meeting gives details on the strategic framework and common country assessment mechanisms, which are designed to develop a coherent and effective international response to a particular country in crisis. This approach looks promising; we would be grateful for more information on how successful the mechanisms have so far been in practice, and how they are going to be developed. We are particularly interested in accelerating work on how to reconstruct the rule of law in conflict-torn countries, and the statement of the European Union spells this out in detail. It is essential to get the police and the judiciary functioning quickly again and to bring to justice those who have committed atrocities.

Third, coordination on the ground has to be matched by coordination at the centre. The Brahimi report contains a key recommendation, in paragraph 47 (d), that the Secretary-General should draw up a comprehensive plan for strengthening the United Nations peace-building capacity. This Council should today be giving its views on what might go into that plan.

The essential foundation is the idea of a continuum of activities: conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peace-building are not separate activities; they cross over and interact with each other. Rivalries and jealousies between different players in the United Nations system have to be broken down, and regional organizations and donor countries must be brought into the strategy. The Secretary-General's leadership and activism in this respect are vital, and the United Kingdom will support him. It would make sense, for instance, in respect of each major conflict in the developing world — and remember that 20 of the 38 poorest countries are or have recently been in the midst of conflict — to establish a team approach at Headquarters which brings all the main actors together operationally.

This is why the United Kingdom has so strongly supported the concept of Integrated Mission Task Forces, also contained in the Brahimi report. It is a pity that the Secretariat has not yet found an opportunity to set one up, despite the endorsement of the Security Council and the General Assembly. There are a number of current missions that would benefit from such an approach, not least the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) and, potentially, the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC). The Security Council itself could feed into such a process through its Working Group on peacekeeping.

Here, let me depart from my text for a moment to say a word about the Security Council itself in this respect. The Security Council is, undoubtedly, a central organization for peace-building, but it cannot achieve results on its own. We are not particularly good at implementation and follow-up. One of the main purposes of the United Kingdom proposal to establish a working group on peacekeeping was to deal with exactly that issue: to interconnect with other parts of the system and focus on implementation and follow-up. There are some good ideas in the European Union statement, as there were in that of Ambassador Levitte, which we have already heard, on how we can proceed with that. We have to remember that not following up, not implementing what we put forward in our resolutions, places a dead hand of inaction over the whole United Nations system because of the central role of the Security Council. We promote the centrality of that role, but we do not fully carry out the implementation process. We cannot go beyond our

remit; we have to coordinate. But to fail to act fully in accordance with our remit puts a burden on the rest of the system.

Fourthly, Member States must bear their own responsibility for cohesion, both internally and with each other. Foreign, finance and development ministries must communicate. Recognizing this, the United Kingdom Government has recently established a Global Conflict Prevention Pool, funded from the budgets of several departments. This represents our own recognition of the need for a more integrated response to conflict. We are keen to look at any effective peace-building measures that might be funded from it.

When I spoke at the Council's open debate last July on the prevention of armed conflict, I said that it was time to convert our fine words into action. There is a long way to go, but I am encouraged to point to a recent example of our beginning to get things right. Here I shall abbreviate the comments set out in my written text.

I refer to the experience of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) and the debate that we had on 26 January, when it was clear, from Sergio Vieira de Mello's briefing, that a process of coordinated developmental planning had gone into the whole UNTAET operation. I think that that experience is beginning to bear fruit. In that meeting we did not focus only on the need for capacity-building in East Timor; equally striking was José Ramos-Horta's emphasis on the need for security for East Timor if all of this effort is to have a lasting effect. UNTAET is certainly far from a perfect mission. It has faced, and will continue to face, some serious problems. But we must also welcome the integration of its approach. As we look ahead to planning a follow-on mission there — which will certainly need a peacekeeping element and civilian police, as well a capacity-building function — we must also look to the past and apply the lessons we have learned from East Timor to the rest of our work.

The report on peace-building that will be issued in March through the Executive Committee on Peace and Security (ECPS) provides a good opportunity for this sort of lessons-learned exercise. The United Kingdom is committed to helping the report produce practical, forward-looking conclusions, and that means taking stock of where we have reached. We must make sure that regional perspectives to conflict prevention and peace-building are taken into account. We are therefore supporting a series of worldwide seminars over the next six weeks, led by the International Peace Academy (IPA), which will help to develop this thinking. The one that will take place in New York on 12 March will complete the series. The IPA and we will be sending colleagues further details.

I hope this debate will help the drafters of the ECPS report to focus on practical proposals to improve United Nations peace-building strategies. What are the key elements of peace-building? Which actors are best placed to implement them? How can coordination within the United Nations system be improved? What roles are there for the ECPS and the Department of Political Affairs peace-building unit? If clear answers to these questions are provided by the report, we will be in a much better position to take a significant step forward in improving the capacity of the United Nations in this essential area and in uniting all the major players in the peace-building field into a coherent whole.

Mr. Mahbubani (Singapore): We should like to thank you, Mr. President, for organizing this timely and important debate, as well as for circulating a very useful background paper on the subject of peace-building. I, like my colleagues, would like to welcome the Secretary-General, who by his presence here demonstrates the importance of the subject that we are discussing.

Just 10 years ago, if we had tried to hold such an open debate, the members of the United Nations community would have been puzzled. The concept of peace-building had not fully surfaced at that time. But in the past decade, after major United Nations operations in Cambodia, Mozambique, East Timor and Kosovo, we do seem to know what peace-building refers to.

In our view, the best single definition of the term was provided by the Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, in his 1997 report (A/51/950) entitled "Renewing the United Nations: a programme for reform". Paragraph 120 of that report states:

> "Peace-building may involve the creation or strengthening of national institutions; the monitoring of elections; the promotion of human rights; the provision of reintegration and rehabilitation programmes; and the creation of

> conditions for resumed development. Peace-building does not replace ongoing humanitarian and development activities in countries emerging from crises. Rather it aims to build on them and introduce further activities or reorientation of existing ones which ... reduce the risk of a resumption of conflict and contribute to creating conditions most conducive to reconciliation, reconstruction and recovery. "

Today, the best active examples are the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET). In these large peacekeeping operations, the United Nations provides an interim civil administration, in addition to a comprehensive peace-building package, which involves establishing entire social systems and governmental institutions from scratch. These are no easy tasks. The best historical precedent for such large-scale operations may have been the work carried out under the Marshall Plan after the Second World War.

Despite the vivid examples of East Timor and Kosovo, there continues to be confusion about the term "peace-building". To obtain some conceptual clarity, it may be useful to make a distinction between what we have called three distinct stages of work.

During the first stage, after a conflict has torn apart a territory or country and there is a desire to re-establish peace with the help of the international community, the United Nations gets a mandate to set up a peacekeeping operation. During the second stage, to ensure that the peace takes permanent root, a peace-building component is inserted. Here again, while East Timor and Kosovo are relatively large operations, we should not rule out the possibility of small-scale operations. For example, the current peace-building work being done in the Central African Republic continues to be important. During the third and final stage, the country or territory can — if the first two stages have been successful — return to nation-building on its own two feet, with the usual help of the development community. Here again, Cambodia and Mozambique provide the best examples of relatively successful nation-building after the end of United Nations peace-building.

One clear reason for introducing such conceptual clarity is to remove the misconception, which surfaced in some recent debates, that the United Nations is overstepping its mandate when it goes into peace-building.

At the conceptual level, we may be able to introduce some clarity to the term "peace-building". At the operational level, however, peace-building can be both messy and difficult. Building a lasting peace after a sustained and painful conflict is an inherently difficult exercise. We are human; we find it difficult to forgive and to live in peace once again with neighbours who may have brought pain and tragedy into our lives. Here again I believe that the Secretary-General also referred to the difficulties of healing the scars of wars when he spoke earlier today.

Given the difficulty of such work, Singapore tried to make a modest contribution in this field by organizing a conference in Singapore in November 1999 called "The Nexus Between Peacekeeping and Peace-building". This conference was organized by the United Nations Institute for Training and Research, the Institute of Policy Studies of Singapore and the Japan Institute of International Affairs.

All the speeches and papers presented at the conference, a summary of the discussions and the conference co-chairpersons' recommendations have been compiled in a book. I am happy to demonstrate this here. Some of you may remember that we actually launched this book at the Singapore Mission last October. We commend this book to those researching and working on peace-building, as it contains many interesting historical descriptions and reflections that could guide us. Indeed, in the rest of my remarks this morning, I plan to cite a few from this book.

For example, when the Vice-President of the International Committee of the Red Cross, Mr. Jacques Forster, spoke, he stressed that the aim of peace-building was to bring about a sustainable long-term peace. To accomplish this, he said that we had to address the root causes of conflict to set in motion "a virtuous and eventually self-sustaining cycle of peace-building".

The United Nations University Vice-Rector, Ramesh Thakur, warned against quick-fix solutions. He said that "the requirements for sustainable peace are different from those of band-aid or fire-fighting responses", and he stressed that "a peace agreement is no solution if it does not last the distance".

Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi also attended the conference, and I am glad that he is here with us this morning. I believe that when he spoke in Singapore he emphasized the need for the international community to provide the considerable resources, human and material, that are essential for peace-building.

The main theme in all their remarks was that for the United Nations to be successful in its peace-building efforts, it has to put into place the conditions for both peace and development. Only then can it exit the scene knowing that the job was done and done well. It cannot be overemphasized that if a peacekeeping mission is pulled out too early, there is a real danger that the conflict it was deployed to resolve could flare up again and become worse than before the peacekeeping operation was established. This would not only put back any potential solution to the problem; it would also damage the credibility of the United Nations itself. It is therefore important that the Security Council, the United Nations, the international community and all other actors involved in peace-building stay the course. Here again I am glad that other speakers have also made this point in their remarks earlier today.

Several other speakers at the conference emphasized the need for all members of the United Nations family involved in peace-building to work together. For example, Professor Jonathan Moore from Harvard University warned that

> "the culture and climate of cooperation and collaboration, mutual respect and reinforcement, among the various parts of the United Nations family which converge in complex crises, is not yet" and I repeat, "is not yet sufficient to ensure a fruitful relationship between peacekeepers and peace-builders".

Mr. David Malone, the President of the International Peace Academy — Ambassador Greenstock also referred to him — echoed the same concerns and noted that the world of peace-building is increasingly characterized by "a multiplicity of actors with overlapping and sometimes contradictory mandates, all competing for scarce resources and each seeking a central role and profile". He added that:

> "The result is that it is increasingly difficult for the United Nations or other international actors to develop a coherent strategy, let alone implement it, for consolidating what has been achieved during negotiations."

Other speakers stressed the need for the United Nations to work closely with the Bretton Woods institutions to ensure that peace-building remains sustainable over the long run.

Hence, when the co-chairpersons of the conference gave their conclusions, one of the key points that they stressed was the need to develop

> "an integrative approach to the design and architecture of the United Nations mission, including both peacekeeping and peace-building components; for all participating agencies to have a common vision of the mission's objectives, so that unnecessary duplication of effort could be avoided; to ensure that there is a reconciliation component in the peace-building process, where peace can continuously be facilitated between belligerent parties; and for the Security Council, Bretton Woods institutions and the donor community to give the United Nations mission the necessary resources of money, skill and time for it to complete its mandate".

It is clear from all the remarks that we have cited that if the international community is to succeed in the major responsibilities of peace-building, all the major multilateral institutions must learn to work together as a team under the leadership of the United Nations. Here again I am glad that several speakers have already made the point; I am especially glad that Ambassador Greenstock emphasized this point in his remarks today. Indeed, we believe this requirement is also true when we go from peace-building to nation-building, which is the third stage. As my Prime Minister said at the Millennium Summit,

> "The United Nations should provide the leadership within the community of multilateral organizations to help the poorer nations develop the capacity to profit from globalization and the knowledge revolution. The United Nations, the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and several other international organizations were created in a different era to deal with different challenges. They need to be updated. Furthermore, these institutions work separately, and not as a team. Today, however, there is an imperative for them to coordinate their efforts. They need to get together to assess what

competencies the poorer nations need to develop in this new era. They should then put in place coordinated programmes to build capacity for globalization and the knowledge revolution. I call upon the Secretary-General to institute regular dialogues among the multilateral organizations to bring about such coordination." (*A/55/PV.5, p.30*)

We hope that the high-level meeting that will take place tomorrow and in which the President of the Security Council will participate will address some of these points. We believe that if all these agencies can learn to cooperate in the difficult area of peace-building, this may lay the foundations for closer and broader cooperation in other areas, too.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Singapore for noting the important document on the Singapore conference.

Mr. Valdivieso (Colombia)(*spoke in Spanish*): I would like to thank the President of the Council for having taken the excellent initiative of convening this open debate to address an item of concern to all Members of the United Nations. This provides us with an opportunity to highlight the growing importance of multidimensional approaches to the solution and prevention of conflict.

The Security Council has major challenges before it in the complex management of current conflicts. We hope that today's debate will benefit this organ and other relevant organs in the United Nations system as we give critical consideration to the experiences of the past, to lessons learned and to ways that we can improve processes for preventing conflict, as well as for building peace.

The responsibility for maintaining peace cannot be considered alone but rather as a part of the wider process ranging from preventive diplomacy to post-conflict peace-building. In order to understand this complex situation, we must consider the fact that the Security Council is only one of the actors, and sometimes the least relevant one, among those participating in the peace-building process. Also, the preponderance of intra-State conflicts in the midst of complex claims of a religious type, of ethnic supremacy and of xenophobia means that the peace-building process has become more complex, longer-term and more painstaking, and sometimes its leads to dissatisfaction among those who are expecting immediate or short-term tangible results.

In such internal wars and conflicts, peace-building frequently occurs after the parties concerned have taken actions that constitute serious violations of human rights and of international humanitarian law with grave consequences for the civilian population. Patient effort is therefore required to restore the social fabric and the minimal conditions for coexistence.

Peace-building has enemies, which can include individuals, businesses, organizations and Governments that do not desire tranquility and stability. Most blameworthy are those involved in the illicit trafficking of small arms, for whom peace-building is bad business.

Because of the strong link between conflict prevention on the one hand and the maintenance of peace and peace-building on the other, these things must be considered together and addressed comprehensively. There have been many studies and assessments of the causes of conflict; thanks in part to these, national Governments and the international community have made considerable progress on various approaches to preventing conflict. But despite the identification of the causes of conflict, and despite the broad formulas and comprehensive approaches to conflict prevention, there are factors that stymie these good intentions. Neither conflict prevention nor peace-building can be successful without genuine political will by all actors, including those responsible for the maintenance of peace, international mediators and the parties to the conflict.

There is no doubt that peace-building is a far more complex and difficult challenge than it appears to be, as experience has shown. Rebuilding societies that have suffered the strife of war and that are bearing the consequences of conflict — social trauma, lack of resources, fragile institutions and political uncertainty — takes long-term sustained effort. But unfortunately, we constantly see erratic, short-term, poorly coordinated commitments by governmental, non-governmental and international organizations and other relevant actors. Sustainability and political will are the two elements that are key to the success of peace-building.

Past Security Council efforts with a broad, comprehensive reconstruction mandate have included those for Namibia, El Salvador, Cambodia, Mozambique and, more recently, East Timor and Kosovo. The only thing they have in common are their

comprehensive mandates, which have included tasks such as: the reorganization and retraining of police forces; judicial reform; formulation or assistance in the formulation of local laws and regulations in the economic and social sphere; help in carrying out agrarian reform; election monitoring; supervision of transitional government departments; the supply of food, drinking water and sanitary and health services; and monitoring human rights. If the Security Council has correctly devised these overall comprehensive mandates, we wonder why the results have been so uneven, with a degree of success in some cases and with huge failure in others.

To respond to that concern, my delegation wishes to put forward some fundamental elements that we would like to see reflected in the presidential statement to be adopted on today's agenda item.

First, peace-building is inherently a long-term process in which short-term positive results do not necessarily lead to ultimate success.

Second, these missions need not be carried out principally by the United Nations; rather, depending on specific conditions, the lead organization can be a regional one.

Third, donor commitment to peace-building processes must be sustained and long-term.

Fourth, the Secretary-General could coordinate the preparation of a compendium of lessons learned over the past two decades, drawing on contributions from national Governments, regional organizations, United Nations agencies and specialized non-governmental organizations.

Fifth, in each case there must be a strategy that will ensure the resources and personnel needed to complete the peace-building process.

And sixth, in each instance the Secretary-General could identify a set of objective benchmarks indicating that peace has been built; this would avoid the premature termination of mandates, which could sow the seeds of new conflicts.

Peace is not the absence of conflict. Peace is a culture, a way of life, a collective yearning. Attaining peace requires — in addition to the will of the parties — a favourable national and international environment. This requires sustainable and lasting long-term commitment.

Mr. Shen Guofang (China) (*spoke in Chinese*): At the outset, Mr. President, I would like to thank you for proposing and convening this open debate on the topic of "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach". I also wish to express my gratitude to you and to the delegation of Tunisia for having prepared a very informative and comprehensive working paper for this meeting. A number of United Nations peacekeeping operations have already, to varying degrees, included tasks of post-conflict peace-building. Therefore, a review of this question by the Security Council is both necessary and timely. I hope that this meeting will help the United Nations in devoting equal attention to and in properly handling both peacekeeping and the promotion of development.

At the Security Council's open debate on the item entitled "No exit without strategy", which was held last November, you said, Sir, that

> "peace and development are intimately linked. Thus, a more sustained commitment of the international community to reducing poverty throughout the world and to promoting sustainable development is both a step towards conflict prevention and a contribution to peace-building". (*S/PV.4223, p. 17*)

I fully agree with that view. Peace and development are the two themes of our time. On the one hand, peace-building would be impossible without achievements on the development front. On the other hand, development in itself is part of any peace-building effort. Development is a global issue with universal relevance.

At present, armed conflicts most often occur in poor and backward developing countries, notably in the least developed countries. From what can be seen in those countries, the root causes of armed conflict are diverse. But the most fundamental one lies in extreme poverty. Poverty leads to social instability, which in turn poses a threat to peace and security at the national and even the regional level. Therefore, a core issue of concern on our agenda should be how to prevent armed conflict and fundamentally ensure lasting peace. The Secretary-General has indicated in past reports that prevention is better than mere reaction. In our view, preventive measures such as pre-conflict mediation and good offices are essential, and can sometimes play an important role.

However, in order to uproot the causes of conflicts, we must help developing countries, especially the least-developed countries, to seek economic development, eradicate poverty, curb diseases, improve the environment and fight against social injustices. This is a more active way of preventive peace-building, which, as compared to post-conflict peace-building, will multiply the accomplishment with half the effort.

A focused effort of post-conflict peace-building helps to prevent the recurrence of conflicts and pave the way for durable peace. The achievement of a ceasefire or peace in a country or region through United Nations peacekeeping operations does not necessarily mean that the root causes of the conflict will die out immediately thereafter. Moreover, due to varying conditions on the ground, peace-building efforts in different places should also vary in form. At the same time, an extended process is required to address and eliminate such root causes as poverty, backwardness, social injustice and ethnic disputes.

The international community should have the patience and resolve to help conflict-afflicted countries and regions to tackle these problems. The speedy disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants and the promotion of the repatriation, resettlement and economic recovery of refugees and displaced persons constitute the short-term objectives of peace-building. The long-term objectives, however, are the eradication of poverty, the development of the economy, good governance and a peaceful and rewarding life for people in post-conflict countries and regions. With regard to the short-term objectives, the United Nations has done a great deal, adopting numerous papers and reports. It has not, however, made sufficient effort with respect to the long-term objectives, which it should study further and concerning which it should enhance its role.

An important question emerging from our debate today concerns the kind of role the Security Council should play in peace-building. In the working paper, you, Sir, have provided some very good and enlightening views on this question. Preceding speakers have also presented very helpful suggestions. We believe that peace-building involves many elements and calls for the active participation of various United Nations bodies and the international community as a whole. The efforts of all involved should be well coordinated, as well as clearly and reasonably defined, and their cooperation should be sustained.

As the primary body entrusted with the maintenance of international peace and security, the Security Council should provide political guidance and coordination in this regard. In certain circumstances, the Security Council should undertake to tailor tasks for peace-building. However, during the planning, establishment and implementing processes of a peacekeeping operation, the Council should consider how to turn peacekeeping into peace-building and its deliberations should help to facilitate the smooth development of peace-building efforts and seek to create favourable conditions for such activity. Such issues as economic and social reconstruction in the peace-building process should be the main tasks of the special agencies of the United Nations development system, the international financial bodies or relevant regional organizations. In order better to achieve our goals, the Security Council should join other relevant United Nations bodies by increasing its consultations to develop an integrated problem-solving programme.

The work of peace-building involves the country concerned, the United Nations, the international community and other relevant players. However, there is no doubt that the country concerned should be at the core of all peace-building efforts. Both during the preventive pre-conflict peace-building process and in the post-conflict peace-building period, the United Nations and the international community at large are always external contributing factors. Their roles lie in helping and supporting the Governments and peoples of post-conflict countries in their reconstruction efforts. The internal affairs of a country should eventually be handled by the people of that country on their own. Therefore, while participating in peace-building efforts, the international community should focus on helping peoples to achieve independence and self-reliance so that their dependence on external assistance will gradually decrease. The people of the country concerned should be encouraged to play a leading role during the peace-building process. The United Nations and the international community should refrain from stealing the show from the main actor.

The Chinese delegation holds that all peace-building and peace-consolidating measures should conform to the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter and have due respect for the political independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of

countries concerned, as well as for the wills of their Governments and peoples. To some extent, peace-building is even more complex than peacekeeping. For example, it is sometimes necessary to help a country concerned to carry out political and economic restructuring. Some of our work may deeply encroach on various aspects of the social life of that country; in certain circumstances, the United Nations may need to carry out certain administrative functions on behalf of a country's Government. In such a case in particular, the United Nations and the international community should fully respect the views of the country concerned and its laws, religious beliefs, customs and traditions. Their activities should conform to the wishes and choices of the people and their actual needs.

In recent years, the United Nations has undertaken peace-building activities in some regions and some of its peacekeeping operations have, to varying degrees, also included peace-building tasks. However, due to different conditions on the ground and to the differing focuses of the missions of peacekeeping operations, it has not yet been possible to find a generally applicable model for peace-building. Therefore, the United Nations still needs to learn judiciously from practices and experiences so as to find better ways to carry out its peace-building efforts.

The United Nations has enjoyed very good cooperation from a number of regional organizations in the field of pre- and post-conflict peace-building. This kind of cooperation should be carried forward. The Fourth United Nations/Regional Organizations High-level Meeting, which is to open tomorrow, will be devoted to the issue of facing the challenge of long-term peace-building. The Chinese delegation welcomes this and looks forward to the Secretariat's briefing on this meeting.

Mr. Gatilov (Russian Federation) (*spoke in Russian*): Our meeting today is devoted to the very important topic of the effective transition from efforts to settle a conflict within the framework of a peacekeeping operation to the stage of peace-building. The timeliness of raising this question is unquestionable, inasmuch as, without a comprehensive approach, one can hardly hope for the establishment of a lasting peace in a post-conflict country.

In the view of the Russian Federation, the process of peace-building can successfully develop only in strict compliance with a peace agreement or other document settling a conflict. An important and integral part of this stage is the implementation of programmes for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants.

Parallel with this is the need to focus efforts on eradicating the root causes of conflicts. As a rule, such causes underlie social and economic problems, which are sometimes compounded by religious, ethnic and other disagreements. There can be no single recipe here, but experience has shown that the most widespread solution provides for the conduct of far-reaching reforms in the area of the ownership of land and other types of property, in taxation and so forth, all of which promote the establishment of new and fairer rules of the game.

Certainly no less important are the political aspects of a settlement, designed to ensure that armed conflict is replaced by the more civilized campaign of ideas. In this connection, we cannot limit ourselves only to the holding of honest and fair elections, since this expression of will cannot in and of itself safeguard social peace. In many situations, what is required is a partial or fundamental restructuring of the entire political structure in a country that has experienced conflict, as a result of which conditions are established for the activities of new political forces personified in the ex-combatants and their political movements.

In the final analysis, all of these efforts must be directed towards the establishment of a society of political pluralism with strong State and social institutions. This, of course, may require legislative reforms, including the introduction of amendments to or the adoption of a new constitution.

Another very important area is that of efforts for national reconciliation. For this purpose, in many recent cases a so-called commission to establish historical truth has been set up. Steps taken in this area are directly linked to the functioning of the court system, the independent activities of which must remain one of the safeguards of reforms under way in a country; therefore, the existing structure might also require reform.

The next key aspect is the activity of law enforcement bodies, security services and the army. As a rule, this aspect also requires close attention both in terms of the renewal or even re-creation of those institutions and in ensuring their non-interference in the nation's political life.

The last, but hardly least important, aspect of post-conflict development is the establishment of good relations with neighbours and the integration of the post-conflict country into existing regional political and economic structures.

To be sure, the world community and its major international Organization, the United Nations, must play an adequate role by lending assistance to post-conflict building. In this connection, we believe it is exceedingly important to respect strictly the post-conflict nation's sovereignty and to bear in mind its national circumstances. The Security Council must play an important role here, especially in the transition from peacekeeping to peace-building, after which the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council and the specialized agencies of the United Nations system should assume the primary one.

Mr. Ryan (Ireland): Ireland welcomes today's debate on peace-building. Remarkably, it is only in very recent years that the Security Council has formally addressed this subject, and today's meeting offers a welcome opportunity to further develop our thinking together. The Swedish Presidency of the European Union will speak later, and Ireland associates itself with that statement.

The debate on peace-building at the United Nations began in earnest only in the early 1990s with the publication of "An Agenda for Peace". We are pleased that the pace of the debate has quickened so markedly. A greater understanding of the concept has evolved, and a recognition of the crucial role to be played by peace-building has developed. This has been reflected in our discussions and in the range of reports of the Secretary-General, which have demonstrated the centrality of peace-building to attempts to assist conflict-riven societies.

The successful contribution of the United Nations to the establishment of peace in Guatemala is, in many respects, our first and exemplary case of peace-building. The United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), which is preparing East Timor for and accompanying it towards independence, and the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK), which is providing an interim administration while establishing transitional institutions for democratic self-administration in Kosovo, are ongoing examples of how well-coordinated peace-building efforts can make a difference.

From Ireland's perspective, peace and stability are inextricably linked to the meaningful engagement of people with the decision-making structures and processes affecting their lives. Accountable public institutions, inclusive political systems and the opportunity to achieve a decent standard of living are some of the basic foundations of any stable society. Peace-building helps to create the conditions where these can take root. The absence of these foundations nourishes conflict. Our own national experience has taught us that problems can often seem intractable and that differences can run very deep. While we would not wish to be over-prescriptive, we have, however, been witness to the need for courage, compromise and the support of the international community in building peace out of violent conflict.

We are agreed that poverty and underdevelopment are major contributing factors to conflict. Of the 34 countries farthest from reaching the international development targets set out in the United Nations global conferences of the 1990s, 22 are affected by current or recent conflict. In most cases, populations in countries experiencing conflict are denied basic human rights; governance is either bad or non-existent; and the right to development is without practical recognition. Clearly, conflict prevention and peace-building call for emphasis on the full range of human rights, including civil, political, economic, social and cultural. Our support for conflict-affected countries in capacity-building for good governance will be a crucial peace-building task.

At last year's Millennium Summit, our heads of State or Government agreed to halve by the year 2015 the large proportion of the world's people living in extreme poverty. If we are to reach that goal and the targets we all agreed at United Nations global conferences, greater achievements must be realized in conflict prevention, peace-building and development. Violent conflict and underdevelopment undermine our efforts while blighting the aspirations of many millions of people. We rightly emphasize the need for each country to recognize ownership and to tackle its problems directly, but we also recognize the indispensable contribution that can be made by the international community.

In addressing the objectives of peace-building programmes, we can draw on the processes in which we have engaged over the past decade. The record is, admittedly, a chequered one, but we should keep in mind that this is difficult terrain in which recurring factors have reappeared. Among these, I would highlight the following: the evident, demonstrated centrality of the United Nations system to major peacekeeping challenges; the direct relationship between the success of peace-building programmes and the adequate commitment of financial and political resources by the international community; the political rhetoric and on-the-ground political obstructionism which have in some contexts exacerbated the failure of political leaderships to respond to peace-building efforts; the accurate assessment and judicious application of varying degrees of leverage that particular characteristics of pre- or post-conflict situations give the international community in engaging in peace-building operations; the need to be highly sensitive to the individual strengths and weaknesses of the political and social fabric and the impact these will have on the post-conflict peace-building process. In countries emerging from conflicts we need to ensure the development of local capacity to manage differences, even deep differences, without violence. We have seen, repeatedly, intertwining political and developmental dimensions of peace-building which require the closest practical cooperation and coordination between, particularly, the Department of Political Affairs, the Office for the Coordination of Humanitarian Affairs, the Department of Peacekeeping Operations and the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). At the field level there is clearly a significant role for UNDP as capacity-builder in the governance area and in the context of the resident coordinator system. Immediate efforts to assist crisis and post-conflict countries should not distort long-term development objectives, but should underpin and reinforce them. Finally, we stress the need for lessons to be learned from experience of the past, and for best practice to be pursued. It is crucial that the structures set up by the United Nations mutually reinforce and complement each other. Coordination must begin in the field if it is to be effective, and it must begin immediately upon the cessation of hostilities.

The Secretary-General will tomorrow meet with the regional organizations. We value these organizations' commitment to the maintenance of international peace and security. We are resorting to them on an increasing basis, not least because we recognize that intra-State violence has regional consequences that must be addressed effectively at the regional level. We have seen regional organizations achieve real successes in addressing conflicts, while mindful of the inherent practical, political and organizational challenges. As a member of the European Union, Ireland is very supportive of the efforts for closer cooperation between the United Nations and the European Union.

We strongly endorsed the Council's decision that those to be responsible for implementing a peace agreement should be present during the planning phases to ensure that the operation is based on realistic assessments, judgements and arrangements. This is essential for the credibility and workability of an agreement and for the integrity of the United Nations when it entrusts an operation to a regional organization. We recognize that the United Nations relationships with the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe and the European Union in Kosovo are positive examples of what can be done in this regard, and that other regional organizations, with international support, also have crucial roles to play.

The Security Council's contribution to conflict resolution is an important element of a broader United Nations capacity. We welcome, for example, the fact that it has now become fairly routine for the heads of the funds and programmes to attend and work with the Council. This is as it should be if we are to adopt a comprehensive and flexible approach to peace-building. Long-term peace-building strategies should figure as a matter of course in the drawing up of Council-mandated operations and missions.

This debate is taking place against the background of rapid developments in the field and within this Organization. The Brahimi report has described peacekeepers and peace-builders as "inseparable partners". They are working, in our names, towards the same objective. It is our clear responsibility to ensure that they are equipped to carry out the tasks we assign to them. This includes clarity in the mandates we give them.

These mandates will, because they must, reflect increasingly an awareness of the spectrum of United Nations peacekeeping, peace-building and development work. They are inextricably linked and, if properly harnessed, they point the route away from conflict and

its root causes, towards societies characterized by good governance, human, civil, political, social and cultural rights, and, crucially, sustainable development.

Mr. Kolby (Norway): Norway welcomes the initiative of the Tunisian presidency for this debate on the concept of peace-building.

Peace-building is a theme of concern both for the United Nations and for regional organizations. We therefore welcome the fact that cooperation for peace-building is the main issue on the agenda for the high-level meeting between the Secretary-General and regional organizations tomorrow and the day after. Regional organizations can often be key instruments for identifying what could be done to build peace and to prevent conflicts and for implementing the steps agreed upon. We would welcome strengthened peace-building cooperation between the United Nations and regional bodies, both in developing mutually supporting mechanisms and in addressing concrete conflict situations.

Peace-building is an important part of the comprehensive approach to United Nations peace operations set forth in the Brahimi report. We look forward to the follow-up reports on peace-building and conflict prevention now in preparation. We trust that all bodies of the United Nations system will give their full support to the establishment of steps needed to move forward. We are convinced that the reports, when they are presented, will provide a foundation for a more comprehensive discussion of the challenges before us when the Council resumes its discussion of this important issue. Norway will come back with a more extensive list of views and ideas when these reports are on the table.

The concept of peace-building is a relative newcomer in the more comprehensive approach to peace operations adopted by the United Nations in the 1990s. Valuable conceptual work has already been done to better understand how peace-building should relate to the other elements in a comprehensive approach to conflict prevention, peace-making, peacekeeping and long-term development. There is a lot of material to draw upon — lessons learned within the United Nations system, the experiences of other international organizations and in more independent evaluations and studies.

Norway supports the view that peace-building has a fundamental political character. It is important to address long-term root causes to prevent both the outbreak and the recurrence of conflict. But in political situations that threaten to deteriorate into armed conflicts, political initiatives are needed. The Security Council has been seized of a number of conflicts that, at some point, have threatened to escalate from bad to worse. Successive Secretaries-General, through the use of their good offices and through the Secretariat, have accumulated a lot of experience in trying to prevent such escalations or relapses into conflicts.

The need to address root causes must never be forgotten. Political efforts for peace-building will have much less of a chance to succeed in situations of mass poverty and despair. Norway believes strongly that the falling trend in international official development assistance transfers not only undermines our efforts to reach the international development goals, it also jeopardizes peace-building efforts. We have seen too often — even in this body — when the red lights of early warning have started flashing, when there are identifiable steps that could be taken to avert disaster, that the resources have simply not been there to take the steps needed early enough.

Norway believes that women can have a particularly important role in peace-building efforts. The Security Council recently had a discussion on women, peace and security. An effective follow-up of Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) will be important to ensure that the underutilized resource that women represent is better integrated into the comprehensive peace-building efforts needed. This will enhance the chance of creating lasting peace solutions.

Voluntary organizations can play a very important role in peace-building. Norway's involvement in the peace processes in the Middle East, Central America and some African conflicts has been based on close collaboration with non-governmental organizations, whose presence on the ground have earned them the respect and confidence of all sides. We therefore strongly support the call by the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations to take heed of the Secretary-General's initiatives to reach out to civil society and strengthen relations with non-governmental organizations, academic institutions and the media.

Norway has for many years supported strengthening the capabilities of the Secretary-General in preventing conflict and building peace. We have supported the proposals in the Brahimi report to this

effect. We think that such measures need to be integrated into and coordinated closely with the work of the United Nations on development issues, to which our commitment is equally great.

The key challenge is now implementation. There is a general need to strengthen the institutional capability of the United Nations to deal more effectively with these important issues in order to implement the decisions of the Security Council. This includes a need for coherence, coordination and the ability to translate early warning into early action.

Coherence is important, as is coordination, not only within the United Nations system, but also with other international organizations and other actors involved in complex operations. Those involved should review priorities and redirect activities and programmes in order to support United Nations peace operations and contribute to a coherent peace-building environment. We should perhaps consider how we can move towards a more systematic structure of consultation among a wider range of actors in the context of Security Council mandates and resolutions.

Capacity on the ground, knowledge and shared analysis are the keys to enhanced coherence and to dealing with the security concerns of the parties involved. Disarmament, demobilization and reintegration; security sector reform; how to incorporate conflicting factions in an army, an administration and political bodies; and the role of development partners in training and competence-building: these are only some of the peace-building elements that may be involved in a given conflict.

The deepening and widening of the scope of peace-building also underlines the crucial need for coherence over time. We must work to break the vicious circle in which declining media attention often results in dwindling international financial support.

The findings of truth commissions in El Salvador, South Africa and elsewhere, as well as of the International Criminal Tribunals, have demonstrated that an atmosphere of impunity can be a major hindrance to true peace-building. We welcome the major strides that have been taken over the past few years in strengthening international criminal justice. We believe that the early establishment of the permanent International Criminal Court will be an important contribution to international peace-building efforts.

The real test of peace-building is in the results on the ground. The Security Council is now embarked on several peace operations with important peace-building mandates which will determine the success or failure of our approach. In East Timor, the ingredients of success are present, thanks to the performance of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor and its partnership with local leaders. We must not let this opportunity slip away from us by abandoning the effort too early. In other situations, peace-building efforts are still at an early stage. Here again, the test will be whether we back up our words with resources.

Mr. Kuchynski (Ukraine): My delegation welcomes today's open debate as a logical extension of a number of discussions held by the Security Council over the past few years on closely related subjects. We recognize the additional relevance and value of our discussion in the light of the forthcoming fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations, to be held tomorrow and the day after tomorrow on the same topic, cooperation for peace-building.

My delegation would therefore like to thank the Tunisian presidency for organizing this timely discussion and for the submission for our consideration of a thoughtful and comprehensive background document. We are also grateful to the Secretary-General for his important and very informative statement.

It is known that over the past decade United Nations peacekeeping efforts have undergone an evolution in the face of new challenges to peace and security, in particular a significant increase in the number and complexity of conflicts. This evolution has given birth to a new generation of operations with multifunctional mandates, not only targeted at stopping the violence and bloodshed but also aimed at preventing the emergence or recurrence of conflicts, as well as facilitating the movement of war-torn societies from violent conflicts towards reconciliation, economic reconstruction and democratic development.

In pursuit of these efforts, the United Nations has accumulated vast and largely successful experience in Namibia, Mozambique, El Salvador, Guatemala, the Central African Republic, Eastern Slavonia, Cambodia and the Republic of Macedonia. Today, the United Nations is involved in large-scale operations with

peace-building components in Kosovo, Bosnia and Herzegovina and East Timor. It has recently established Peace-building Support Offices in Liberia, Guinea-Bissau, the Central African Republic and Tajikistan. The United Nations peace-building process in Haiti is still under way. We look forward to examining the forthcoming proposals of the Secretary-General on the establishment of a peace-building mission for Somalia.

All of these examples testify to the fact that the issue of peace-building is becoming increasingly topical for the United Nations; its peace-building efforts are in very great demand throughout the world. Looking at peace-building from the conceptual standpoint, we remain of the view that it is inseparably linked to conflict prevention. In this context, we recognize the distinction between preventive peace-building, embracing a wide variety of long-term political, institutional and developmental activities to address the structural causes of conflicts, and post-conflict peace-building, encompassing reconstruction and development efforts to prevent the recurrence of conflict.

We fully share the view that the time has come to define a common approach to peace-building and to work towards a comprehensive and universally agreed strategy for peace-building and conflict prevention, involving all international partners. This view is, by and large, in line with the proposal that Ukraine advanced at the Millennium Summit and the Security Council Summit on the need to elaborate a comprehensive United Nations strategy for conflict prevention on the basis of the large-scale use of preventive diplomacy and peace-building. We hope that the ongoing efforts to reform the existing mechanism of United Nations peacekeeping, which were boosted by the Brahimi report and blessed by the Millennium Summit, will yield the expected results.

Obviously, the implementation of such a comprehensive strategy will require effective interaction between all bodies and agencies of the United Nations, as well as the active input of Member States, regional organizations, international financial institutions, non-governmental organizations, local stakeholders and other players. At the same time, my delegation is convinced that the United Nations should retain the primary role as the coordinator and originator of these activities. In this regard, the idea of developing a permanent mechanism within the United Nations to coordinate international peace-building efforts could be very helpful.

It is recognized that the existing capacities of the United Nations system in pursuing peace-building strategies in terms of economic development are not fully utilized. Meanwhile, there is no need to prove that poverty and underdevelopment are among major contributing factors to conflicts. The efforts to eradicate poverty and promote sustainable development constitute an integral part of the process of long-term peace-building and conflict prevention. In this context, we welcome the recently increased attention of the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), which is in a position to assist conflict-riven societies in overcoming the consequences of the conflicts, to its role in crisis and post-conflict situations. We hope that this positive tendency will further grow.

The role of international financial institutions and the international donor community at large in providing the necessary funds and resources to the collective peace-building efforts can hardly be overestimated. We believe that more active involvement of these institutions in this work in the future should be further encouraged.

I would also like to mention the importance for peace-building approaches of the effective implementation of programmes of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) of ex-combatants. In this context, permanent attention, in our view, should be drawn to the issue of combating the illicit traffic in arms, which has a direct impact on the DDR process in peacekeeping environments. We hope that the 2001 United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, to be held in July, will strengthen international efforts in this field and contribute to the effectiveness of the DDR process in existing and future United Nations operations.

As regards the situation of child soldiers, let me reiterate my country's position that including the post of child protection adviser in the staff of all United Nations peacekeeping forces and peace-building missions should become standard practice.

Securing the rights of refugees and internally displaced persons to repatriation and resettlement, as well as their property rights, is yet another vital element of the United Nations peace-building efforts. We also cannot agree more with the view that the

establishment of democratic institutions and the promotion of human rights and good governance are prerequisites for the ultimate success of peace-building and conflict prevention. In this context we recognize the growing role of the United Nations police component in ensuring these decisive factors.

My delegation shares the views of the President, expressed in his letter before us today, that the Security Council can play the role of the international community's catalyst for attention and commitment to the demands of peace-building efforts, especially post-conflict peace-building. At the same time, we believe that when the United Nations peace efforts in a zone of conflict reach the stage of long-term preventive peace-building, the Security Council should pass the main player's baton to other bodies of the United Nations, like UNDP, to coordinate further international efforts to this end.

We also believe that the practice of consultations between the United Nations Security Council and the regional organizations involved with the United Nations in joint endeavours of post-conflict peace-building — like the one we had a week ago with the Chairman-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe — should be established on a regular basis.

Finally, let me assure you, Mr. President, that my country, which has the experience of participation in eight United Nations operations or missions with peace-building elements, intends to continue further its practical contribution to strengthening the United Nations capacities for peace-building and the elaboration of a comprehensive approach to it.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Ukraine for his kind words addressed to my delegation.

Mr. Kassé (Mali) (*spoke in French*): The question before the Council today has been on the United Nations agenda for more than a decade. Today's debate is being held on the eve of the fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and the regional organizations on the theme "Cooperation for peace-building". My delegation is grateful to the President of the Council, as well as to the delegation of Tunisia, for taking the initiative of organizing this open debate of the Security Council on "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach". I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his important statement.

I would like to refer to a few issues that in the view of my delegation require special attention. The first is the need to deal with the root causes of conflict. Today it is acknowledged that peace-building does not solely involve post-conflict situations but also encompasses a whole series of long-term activities in the political, institutional and development fields. Actually, the implementation of such measures helps to do away with root causes of conflict, in particular internal conflict. This is why it is important that we establish programmes for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants.

Similarly, special attention should be given to the problem of the circulation and illicit trafficking in small arms and light weapons. These weapons in circulation in developing countries, especially in Africa, are responsible for 90 per cent of deaths caused by conflicts in the post-cold war period. The struggle against this trafficking is a peace-building activity. The international community must mobilize and work towards the elaboration of normative international laws that are progressive and effective in nature to take control of the situation of illicit trafficking of this category of arms. To this end, the United Nations Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects, which will be held here in New York in July 2001, to be a success — something we all hope for — should deal with all the aspects, including those pertaining to the legal trade, and with the transparency that is required for that.

The Security Council Summit in September 2000 emphasized that in order for the Council to be effective and to carry out its responsibilities for maintaining international peace and security effectively, it is essential to cope with conflicts at all stages — that is, from prevention to settlement, and then to peace-building.

Another aspect just as important in this problem of peace-building pertains to the need to adopt a global and integrated strategy. To this end, it is important for all those involved in this sphere — including United Nations bodies and agencies and regional and subregional organizations, as well as international financial institutions — to lend their assistance to do away with tensions before they lead us to the outbreak of a genuine armed conflict. Similarly, when the Council decides to deploy a peacekeeping mission, it is important to elaborate the strategies for the establishment and consolidation of peace, including for

the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, especially child soldiers, as well as other groups in society that have been excluded from productive activities that generate income.

In the same vein, my delegation is of the view that we should carry out that conflict-prevention and peace-building strategy in close cooperation and coordination with the relevant regional and subregional organizations. In that regard, the recommendations set out in the report of the Secretary-General entitled "We the peoples: the role of the United Nations in the twenty-first century" (A/54/2000) and in the report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations (S/2000/809) deserve our full support. Recent events in Sierra Leone indicate the valuable role that regional organizations can play. Their efforts should thus be supported through regular consultations and more frequent contacts between the Security Council and officials from those organizations; these would be useful opportunities to exchange information and to consider the situation if joint peace-building action is deemed necessary.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Mali for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh): It is a great pleasure for me and my delegation to take part in this debate on "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach". We commend you, Mr. President, for taking the initiative to organize this debate and also for circulating the background paper (S/2001/82), which we find very useful. We are grateful to the Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, for a very focused opening statement, which put the issue in perspective.

Throughout the decade of the 1990s – starting with the first Security Council summit, in 1992, followed by major United Nations conferences covering issues of the environment, human rights, population, women's issues and social development – the overarching theme of peace and its multifaceted relationship with development has influenced our thinking. All these years, keeping the peace has been a major and recurrent preoccupation of the United Nations as conflicts kept breaking out and as peacemaking succeeded or failed. I want to make some general observations in relation to the concept of peace-building, its current pattern and the role of the United Nations, the international community and other actors, as well as some remarks on specific points.

In numerous forums, both inside the United Nations and outside it, the concept of peace-building has been addressed during discussions of conflict prevention and peacekeeping. We note a convergence of views in these discussions: that peace-building is closely linked with peacekeeping and conflict prevention, a view which Bangladesh fully shares. In "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111), the then Secretary-General termed it as the counterpart of preventive diplomacy, which seeks to avoid the breakdown of peaceful conditions. The validity of the concept was then affirmed in the Secretary-General's supplement to "An Agenda for Peace" (S/1995/1). We share the perception that peace-building may be viewed as a stage in a continuum, embracing a series of activities aimed at sustaining peaceful conditions in order to prevent, on the one hand, the recurrence of conflict and, on the other, to construct a new environment, restoring a sense of confidence and well-being among people.

This brings me to the second point about the pattern of peace-building activities that we see today. The supplement to "An Agenda for Peace" mentions demilitarization, the control of small arms, institutional reform, improved police and judicial systems, the monitoring of human rights, electoral reform and supervision of elections, social and economic development, et cetera. In addition, facilitation of humanitarian assistance, return of refugees and internally displaced persons, release of prisoners of war and detainees, determination of the fate of missing persons and demining have been covered in other cases. It goes without saying that the demands of the situation must be a determining factor in designing such activities.

Thirdly, there is a need for a comprehensive approach. Clearly, many of these activities fall within the operational jurisdiction of various programmes, funds, offices and agencies of the United Nations system. It is evident that, among the major organs, the General Assembly and the Security Council will also have to engage in greater coordination. This exemplifies the need for a comprehensive and integrated approach. We believe that such coordination has to be borne in mind from the very beginning of planning a peacekeeping operation, which would also augur well for a smooth transition from peacekeeping

to peace-building and, when normalcy is restored, for transfer of responsibilities to other entities mentioned a moment ago.

In our debate last year on the item entitled "No exit without strategy", we emphasized setting clear political objectives for a peacekeeping operation, which is a task for the Council. But it is also a task that the Council can accomplish only if it employs a clear and objective assessment of the situation and of its various linkages. Along with this, knowledge about the in-house expertise in the Secretariat and the comparative advantages of other actors are important inputs for the Council's decision making. I will elaborate further on this point a little later.

On the need for local ownership of peace-building activities, Bangladesh believes it is important constantly to bear in mind the issue of advancing a sense of confidence and well-being in the target population. In designing and executing peace-building projects, it is important from the outset to instil in them a sense of ownership of these activities. We must engage the community and the local stakeholders in a consultative mechanism and explore local skills and expertise in order to enhance their acceptability.

Bangladesh believes strongly that special recognition must be given to the role of women in the peace-building process, particularly in the post-conflict phase.

Bangladesh attaches high importance to catering to the immediate needs of the stricken population. Among other elements, poverty eradication and employment generation are critically important in this regard. Effective and high-visibility projects that make a real difference should be given priority on the list of peace-building activities. In a welcome development, the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo has made arrangements to put in place a microcredit programme, and efforts are under way to do the same in East Timor. We would like to renew our emphasis on such initiatives.

Recent experience shows that such external actors as regional or subregional organizations, international financial institutions and non-governmental organizations play a crucial role in peace-building activities. Establishing mechanisms for regular contact and coordination with them will help the United Nations in its peace-building activities. In that regard, we welcome the meetings with regional organizations that will take place over the next two days. One could cite here the important role that the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) has played in Kosovo, in particular in providing assistance in the training of the police and the judiciary. Such expertise and experience should be used by the United Nations. We believe that a regularly updated repertoire of relevant civil-society organizations should be maintained and that the Council should use the Arria formula in keeping in touch with them.

We cannot overlook the role of the international community and the media. They should assume a supportive role by creating an environment for maintaining the momentum of peace activities and should generate public opinion in favour of social and financial investment in the peace-building efforts of the United Nations. That alone can prepare the ground for concerted international action by State and non-State actors.

As evidenced by recent statistics, it is the intrastate conflicts, with all their attendant complexities, that have increasingly been the United Nations preoccupation. It is likely that this pattern will continue, requiring the United Nations to undertake complex tasks, such as building state institutions, maintaining law and order and raising a security or defence force. We believe that it would be important for the United Nations to undertake pro-active networking with entities with proven expertise and to develop strategic partnerships through judicious burden-sharing on the basis of comparative advantage.

I should not conclude without underscoring an oft-repeated statement that the United Nations is what its Members want it to be. Individually and collectively, we must demonstrate the necessary political will to take hard decisions, at least in order to show that we are capable of learning from our past mistakes. There is no need to argue that there have been mistakes in the past and that not much political will has been shown to learn from them.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Bangladesh for his kind words addressed to me.

Mr. Neewoor (Mauritius): First of all, allow me to thank you, Sir, for convening today's open debate on the important subject of "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach". I also wish to thank the Secretary-General for his opening statement today.

This meeting is indeed very timely, as over the next two days the Fourth High-level Meeting will take place between the United Nations and regional organizations, which will also reflect on this important issue. We thank you, Sir, for your comprehensive background document.

The Charter of the United Nations speaks of wars, aggressions, disputes and conflicts essentially as situations of belligerency involving two or more sovereign States. In such situations, United Nations peacekeeping operations would normally involve deployment along the international frontiers of the opposing sides so as to keep peace between them. There is no scope for a larger role for a United Nations operations in conflict situations of this kind.

Since the United Nations Charter was written, the world has changed dramatically. We may not be totally freed from situations in which two or more States use or threaten to use force to resolve differences, but increasingly at the United Nations, and in the Security Council in particular, we have been dealing instead with civil conflicts. The striking examples are Somalia, Angola, Cambodia, Liberia, the Central African Republic, Yugoslavia, Rwanda, Burundi, Sierra Leone, Haiti, Georgia, East Timor and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. The United Nations has been drawn into all these cases, either through peacekeeping operations or missions of other kinds, so as to stop the fighting, to prevent genocide or to deal with massive humanitarian situations and, in some cases, has even provided interim administration, such as in East Timor and Kosovo.

The Brahimi report, in our view, rightly concludes that "peacekeepers and peace-builders are inseparable partners" (*S/2000/809, para. 28*). Civil wars usually leave populations bitterly divided. More often than not in post-conflict situations, new political processes need to be undertaken for the emergence of a credible Government. Law and order need to be fully restored to enable refugees and internally displaced persons to return home in an atmosphere of security. Institutions have to be built to ensure proper governance. Human resources have to be developed through training facilities. Infrastructures damaged during the conflict have to be rebuilt. Above all, the devastated economy must be relaunched. All this can happen in a post-conflict situation only with the massive support of the international community for peace-building.

Following the first Security Council summit in 1992 and the subsequent publication of *An Agenda for Peace*, there have been a greater interest and engagement by the United Nations in post-conflict peace-building operations. Through these operations, our Organization has made a remarkable difference in the lives of numerous citizens in Namibia, Guinea-Bissau, Mozambique, Guatemala, El Salvador and elsewhere.

There is no doubt that, for a peace-building operation to be successful, it requires a comprehensive and holistic approach. Several components are essential to bringing about sustained peace in the aftermath of a conflict. The need for demilitarization, control of the illicit flow of small arms and light weapons, the setting-up of proper democratic institutions, respect for the rule of law, efficient civilian police, an improved judicial system, electoral reform and respect for human rights, along with socio-economic development, are crucial to the restoration of peace and normalcy.

I would wish to highlight the following aspects, which are deemed important for successful peace-building. By destroying yesterday's weapons used in conflicts, we would prevent their further use in future wars. The illicit trade and mass flow of small arms and light weapons on the African continent are only adding fuel to an already explosive situation.

We also believe that, after the settlement of a conflict, States should be encouraged and assisted to establish laws and procedures for the safe and effective collection and destruction of illegal small arms and light weapons. By so doing, the risk of the warring parties' turning again to the use of arms could be mitigated. In this regard, we wish to underscore the need for all arms embargoes to be fully respected by the international community. The United States and the Southern African Development Community signed a declaration in December last year on United Nations sanctions and restraint in sale and transfers of conventional arms to regions of conflict in Africa. The declaration, inter alia, calls on States to adopt and implement national controls and measures to prevent the flow in conflict areas in Africa of confiscated arms, as well as those collected following the cessation of civil and international conflicts. We consider this to be an important step towards peace-building in African situations.

We have seen in Mozambique weapons exchanged for such tools as sewing machines, hoes and construction materials that helped the rehabilitation of former combatants. In Albania, community-based pilot programmes provided health care, new schools and proper infrastructure to communities in exchange for arms and ammunition. We believe that this kind of programme should be integrated into all peace-building operations.

A major impediment to peace-building and reconstruction after an internal conflict is, in many cases, the serious problem of landmines, millions of which remain scattered in the conflict zones. From Mozambique to southern Lebanon, landmines are still affecting the lives of millions of people. There can be no infrastructural development or agricultural activities in areas pitted with landmines. We would wish to appeal to countries with the necessary technical expertise and informative maps of the mined areas to redouble their efforts in assisting demining activities. This would indeed be a major contribution towards peace-building.

My delegation wishes to reiterate that there can be no durable peace without good governance, sound democratic practices and respect for the rule of law and transparency. Free and fair elections are one of the important pillars that sustain democratic societies. It is a fact that democracies rarely go to war against each other. It is equally true that democracies have a lower level of internal conflicts than non-democracies.

My delegation wishes to underscore the importance of putting in place a democratically elected Government once a peace agreement has been reached. It is encouraging to note that the Electoral Assistance Division of the United Nations is providing more and more assistance to electoral processes worldwide. Illegitimate and non-credible regimes very often carry the seeds of instability that eventually lead to frustration among the population, as a result of which conflicts may arise.

Governments have a major responsibility in the process of confidence-building. They should be encouraged to undertake national reconciliation and to promote unity, as well as demonstrate respect for human rights. States should avail themselves of the expertise of the United Nations, including through the High Commissioner for Human Rights, in drafting national plans of action for human rights and strengthening their judicial institutions. There will be no sustained peace and security if individuals continue to live in fear of arbitrary arrest and detention.

Newly established democratic Governments should also enlist the expertise of the International Civil Service Commission to help build a credible, transparent and accountable public administration. Corruption, malpractice and distorted decision-making not only stall economic development but also discourage foreign investment. For this reason alone, we ponder why several countries are still crippled in poverty despite being endowed with rich natural resources.

Last week we renewed the mandate of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), and everyone expressed satisfaction at the fact that the people of East Timor were heading towards the achievement of their cherished goal of independence. The role of UNTAET in training the East Timorese to take charge of their administrative machinery and institutions, which are the prerequisites for a newly independent democratic nation, demonstrates the resolve of the United Nations for a comprehensive approach towards peace-building.

The success of a peace-building operation lies to a great extent in the sense of security felt by citizens. The training, reforming and restructuring of local police forces are very important components of peace-building. My delegation subscribes to paragraphs 39 to 41 of the Brahimi report, especially with regard to the call for a doctrinal shift in the use of civilian police and human right experts in complex peacekeeping operations, with a view to strengthening the legal institutions and improving human rights.

The rehabilitation and resettlement of the local population after conflicts remain the central objectives of any peace-building undertaking. Our efforts should be focused more and more at creating the conditions conducive to sustainable economic growth necessary for reconstruction.

United Nations agencies, regional organizations and non-governmental organizations are already heavily engaged in reconstruction activities. However, we would like to see more timely efforts applied towards the construction of basic physical infrastructures, proper transportation and telecommunications, schools and public health facilities as part of the reconstruction programmes.

Education would indeed provide the younger generation with technical and professional training, which is the essential foundation for the acquisition of skills. These are important elements that would eventually lead to job creation and consequently enhance the quality of life of the people.

In conclusion, let me add that with the designation of the Department of Political Affairs as the focal point within the United Nations for post-conflict peace-building, there has been better coordination and progress in peace-building activities. We welcome the initiative taken to invite the World Bank to participate in the Executive Committee on Peace and Security, which is responsible for the design and implementation of post-conflict peace-building initiatives within the United Nations. We must also work towards enhancing the coordination role of the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) within the United Nations, since with the growing number of conflicts, there is greater need to make peace-building operations a high priority. Article 65 of the United Nations Charter lays down clearly the parameters for cooperation between the Security Council and ECOSOC. We believe that Article 65, which so far has been applied only once — in 1999, in favour of Haiti — should become a vital instrument for comprehensive United Nations post-conflict peace-building efforts.

Finally, peace-building enterprises can succeed only if they are backed by the necessary financial support. We hope that the United Nations, the international financial institutions and the donor community will work together concertedly to make sure that what we are discussing today does not remain a dead letter.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: I thank the representative of Mauritius for the kind words he has addressed to me.

Given the lateness of the hour, and with the consent of Council members, I will suspend the meeting until 3 p.m.

The meeting was suspended at 1.15 p.m.

United Nations S/PV.4272 (Resumption 1)

Security Council

Fifty-sixth year

Provisional

4272nd meeting

Monday, 5 February 2001, 3 p.m.
New York

President:	Mr. Ben Mustapha	(Tunisia)
Members:	Bangladesh	Mr. Chowdhury
	China	Mr. Shen Guofang
	Colombia	Mr. Valdivieso
	France	Mr. Levitte
	Ireland	Mr. Ryan
	Jamaica	Miss Durrant
	Mali	Mr. Kassé
	Mauritius	Mr. Neewoor
	Norway	Mr. Kolby
	Russian Federation	Mr. Gatilov
	Singapore	Mr. Mahbubani
	Ukraine	Mr. Kuchynski
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Sir Jeremy Greenstock
	United States of America	Mr. Cunningham

Agenda

Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach

Letter dated 25 January 2001 from the Permanent Representative of Tunisia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General (S/2001/82)

This record contains the text of speeches delivered in English and of the interpretation of speeches delivered in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the *Official Records of the Security Council*. Corrections should be submitted to the original languages only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Service, room C-178.

01-23861 (E)

The meeting was resumed at 3.20 p.m.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Sweden. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Norström (Sweden): I have the honour to speak on behalf of the European Union. The Central and Eastern European countries associated with the European Union - Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania, Slovakia and Slovenia - and the associated countries, Cyprus and Malta, as well as the European Free Trade Association countries members of the European Economic Area, Iceland and Liechtenstein, align themselves with this statement.

The absence of war is not the same as lasting peace. A ceasefire is seldom the end of a conflict but, at best, a first step towards the peaceful settlement of armed conflict. We know, from often painful experience, how difficult it is to sustain a peace that does not rest on a solid base. Therefore, a long-term and comprehensive approach is necessary to resolve discord, consolidate peace and prevent the resurgence of conflict.

We must all act to ensure that efforts to foster peace and stability before, during and after armed conflict are well coordinated and part of a coherent strategy. This means linking together long-term efforts of conflict prevention and peace-building with more short-term efforts, such as peacekeeping and other forms of crisis management.

The European Union welcomes today's debate as a sign of an increasing awareness of the importance of linking together the range of measures to build peace. For example, the maintenance of peace requires that the root causes of conflict be addressed. The European Union welcomes the emphasis in the Brahimi report on this aspect and appreciates in particular that the report presents conflict prevention, peacekeeping and peace-building as a continuum of measures aimed at building a solid foundation for peace.

While acknowledging that there may be differences in emphasis between preventive and post-conflict peace-building, the European Union believes that any sharp distinction overlooks the fact that the tools deployed in both situations are broadly similar. In fact, there is a circular effect, since measures that effectively build peace also serve the purpose of preventing conflict from recurring.

The European Union believes that the concept of peace-building must encompass concrete measures targeted at preventing disputes from turning into violence. For example, combating illicit trade in small arms or conflict diamonds can contribute to preventing conflicts and building sustainable peace. Furthermore, peace-building efforts should include confidence-building measures and the promotion of national reconciliation, as well as programmes for the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants. Such a comprehensive approach is also needed to ensure an effective response to suffering and insecurity caused by, for example, small arms and light weapons and the use of child soldiers.

The European Union attaches particular importance to integrated and effective measures to achieve sustainable post-conflict repatriation and reintegration of refugees and other displaced persons. Attention must also be given to the effects on the stability of the host country or surrounding areas of refugees in temporary settlements.

The concept of peacekeeping entails long-term efforts aimed at preventing armed conflict from erupting in the first place by addressing its deep-rooted structural causes. This includes broader measures in the political, institutional, economic and developmental fields, ranging from trade and environment to good governance and human rights. Sustainable development is clearly an essential factor in peace-building. Combating poverty and promoting an equitable distribution of resources are vital elements in preventing conflict and consolidating peace.

The European Union is in the process of reforming its external aid in order to make it more coherent in its approach to third countries, more focused on clear policy objectives, more flexible in responding to a rapidly changing international environment and more consistent in its implementation. One of the features of the reform is closer coordination with other international donors, as highlighted by Commissioner Nielson's recent visit to New York. Furthermore, the European Union has made substantial progress in developing its capabilities for crisis management. These capacities will be of importance in the broader context of peace-building, through, for example, the provision by the European Union of

civilian police in international missions as a form of voluntary cooperation. Moreover, a programme aimed at strengthening the preventive capacities of the European Union will be considered by the European Council in June 2001.

The pursuit of justice and reconciliation is pivotal for effective peace-building. The rule of law, full respect for human rights, democratic foundations for political and judicial systems, and their democratic functioning must be ensured. Good governance, including the promotion of accountability and transparency in public decision-making and the effective participation of civil society and political pluralism and legitimacy, is also a fundamental component.

The European Union wishes to emphasize the important role of international law in building peace. For example, the International Criminal Tribunals for Rwanda and for the former Yugoslavia have served important accountability, reconciliation, deterrence and peace-building functions. The European Union has actively supported measures to ensure accountability for criminal acts under international law. We wish to underline in this regard the importance of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and renew our call upon all States to become parties to the Statute.

We would also like to highlight the role played by civil society, in particular at the local level, in fostering reconciliation. Avoiding marginalization and discrimination are cornerstones of effective peace-building. Measures to promote equality and ensure respect for human rights should therefore be included in any strategy aimed at building sustainable peace. In this context, the European Union wishes to underline the central role played by the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights and the importance of adequate support for effective programmes undertaken by her Office.

The United Nations, with its Charter responsibilities, global presence and broad institutional framework, is uniquely placed both to tackle root causes of conflict and to take short-term preventive measures. But the challenges confronting the international community in the promotion and maintenance of peace are both numerous and diverse. They thus require joint efforts and complex, integrated policy responses that must be delivered by a broad range of actors, including those with specific mandates under international law.

It is well recognized that Security Council peacekeeping mandates should incorporate, as appropriate, peace-building elements, when called for, to support a peace process in order to establish at an early point the activities necessary for peace-building and to determine the means of coordination and cooperation, both between the various components of the peacekeeping operation and with other relevant actors. When a peacekeeping presence is reduced or withdrawn, it is also important to ensure that peace-building activities can be undertaken in an environment that does not threaten peace. Thus, the Security Council must not disengage too early. The smooth transition from peacekeeping to peace-building and a sound exit strategy are fundamental elements for preventing a conflict from recurring. This was amply emphasized in the Security Council debate in November 2000 on the item "No exit without strategy".

The European Union recognizes the need for close cooperation and dialogue, carried out in a mutually reinforcing manner, among United Nations bodies in support of effective peace-building, and it notes in that context the important functions of the General Assembly and of the Economic and Social Council in the areas of rehabilitation and reconstruction.

The role of the Secretary-General and of the Secretariat is crucial. We particularly recognize the importance of strengthening the information-gathering and analytical capacity of the Secretariat. Adequate resources and support must, furthermore, be ensured to enable the Department of Political Affairs to perform effectively its role as focal point in peace-building and conflict prevention. The European Union welcomes the establishment of the Post-conflict Peace-building Unit in support of that role.

With regard to United Nations peace-building offices, the European Union considers that, where appropriate, they have a role in providing a focal point and in enhancing partnership and coordination arrangements in countries emerging from conflict. The European Union furthermore recalls the paramount importance of mobilizing, in a coordinated manner, all actors responsible for peace-building, in particular United Nations funds and programmes, the international financial institutions and bilateral donors,

with the aim both of ensuring their full and early participation in formulating comprehensive peace-building strategies, and of avoiding financial gaps between peacekeeping and peace-building activities.

Closer cooperation between the United Nations and its regional partners in tackling the challenges of peace is a key element. Successful peace-building requires active support from and participation by regional actors. The European Union is committed to building more effective partnerships, notably with the United Nations but also with other regional organizations. We would like also to point to the valuable contribution often made by civil society, including non-governmental organizations and the private sector, in the field of peace-building.

The United Nations and the regional actors possess different strengths and capabilities in the area of conflict prevention and peace-building. Their focus should be on achieving greater complementarity as mutually reinforcing institutions making use of comparative advantages. The fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations, due to begin tomorrow here in New York, will provide an excellent opportunity to promote both complementarity and coordination.

Development activities and peace-building measures are two sides of the same coin. There can be no development without peace. The European Union fully recognizes the importance of development aid as a part of long-term efforts aimed at building prosperity and durable peace.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Baali (Algeria) (*spoke in French*): The Algerian delegation is delighted and proud to see this most important of organs meeting under the presidency of the representative of a country with so many strong links to our own, links forged over the centuries both in the struggle against adversity and in generous and fruitful exchanges that today move us towards a shared destiny. My pleasure is all the greater because for many years I have had the privilege of knowing you, Mr. President, as a talented diplomat who has placed his intelligence and his heart at the service of the cause of justice and progress and who will wisely guide the work of the Council towards the success we anticipate.

I wish also to express my appreciation and admiration to Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore for his enormously successful presidency of the Security Council at a time when he was taking his first steps as a freshly elected newcomer to the Council.

The item, Mr. President, on which you have called for a transparent and democratic debate is a timely one, because it comes before the Council in the wake of the rich discussions held at the Millennium Summit and of those prompted by the report (S/2000/809) of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations chaired by Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi; it also lies at the heart of the whole question of peacekeeping. We must think together about the methodology to be followed and about the means to be put in place so that, once peace is restored after a given conflict, a process of peace-building can immediately be set in motion with a view to attaining lasting peace and stability. In other words, we must formulate and set up a comprehensive, integrated long-term strategy; this requires methodical organization, effective coordination, strict follow-up and, obviously, adequate financing.

To that end, it is useful if not imperative that certain conditions be met both in the preparation and in the implementation of such a strategy.

First of all, all those whose contribution is needed should be involved and should be able effectively to make that contribution. That applies, of course, to the Security Council, which under the Charter bears primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security. But it applies also to the General Assembly and to the Economic and Social Council, which have a major role to play, as well as to the funds and agencies of the United Nations and to the Bretton Woods institutions, without whose involvement any effort in this sphere will be doomed to failure.

In addition to those key players, it is appropriate also to involve the States of the region concerned and regional and subregional political and economic groupings, which possess a keener knowledge of the situation on the ground and whose influence on the course of events can be decisive.

Also, the causes of conflict should be carefully analysed and properly addressed in order to avoid the same causes giving rise to the same effects. These causes are numerous, and often relate to poverty, a

source of frustration, despair and bitterness, as well as to a lack of democracy and to poor administration of public affairs. Particularly in the case of Africa, they can also relate to the injustice established by brutal colonization that did not respect human beings or the subtle balances established over centuries. They can relate too to the consequences of poor choices that may have been made, when emerging from the darkness of colonialism, by public authorities facing immense challenges and expectations that were as complex as they were urgent.

Finally, such a strategy must be able to offer the country or region concerned a real chance of resuming a normal life in peace and order, and above all of embarking on the path of progress, justice and freedom.

In that connection, let me share with the Council a number of thoughts and considerations. First, it is generally agreed today that disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) programmes are a fundamental element in the process of peace-building. Indeed, last year the Security Council devoted a meeting to that subject, at which important thoughts and recommendations were set out. The proliferation of internal conflicts, in which Governments often face armed rebellion, involves the often difficult and complex task of demobilizing yesterday's rebels, who are today's partners for peace. That is why we suggest that, in cooperation with the Department for Disarmament Affairs and the Department of Peacekeeping Operations, DDR programmes be included as one of the elements of operations. Such programmes should thus be a part of the activities of United Nations missions, in close cooperation with the parties; they should be financed from an operation's overall budget, as indeed was proposed by the General Assembly working group on the causes of conflict in Africa.

This is a complex and highly risky operation, undertaken to ensure the orderly and effective reintegration of former combatants into society in such a way that they are not tempted, for one reason or another, to take up their weapons again.

Special attention also needs to be given to the untenable tragedy of child soldiers. While calling for respect by the warring parties for civilians, especially women and children, and for the non-recruitment of soldiers under the age of 18, the international community must, through the United Nations and its funds and agencies, make a special effort genuinely to address the issue of child victims of war, be they direct or indirect participants, so as to give them the care they need and allow them to be gradually reintegrated into society.

Secondly, among the most tragic consequences of conflicts are the hordes of refugees cast onto the road of exile, of whom the media occasionally give us a glimpse in their untold suffering. This tragedy requires us to address a number of concerns, such as how to meet the needs of these refugees, ensure their protection and interact with the countries of asylum. While the return of refugees to their countries of origin must be a post-conflict priority, that return must nonetheless be correctly prepared for and implemented. The reintegration of refugees must, in fact, allow them gradually to resume a normal life thanks not only to the return of peace, but also to a process of reconstruction and economic recovery.

The special attention that refugees should enjoy is called for, inter alia, by the fact that they are in the category that has experienced the worst of war. It is therefore normal that they be able to see their situation improve with the return of peace. In this respect, the fundamental contribution must be made by national authorities, while international organizations — the United Nations in particular — must give the country concerned significant assistance, especially since the reintegration of refugees generally leads to a reduction in the number of those who benefit from humanitarian assistance.

Thirdly, when war crimes or genocide have been perpetrated, as was the case in the former Yugoslavia and in Rwanda, justice must be implacable, because nothing is more pernicious or more fearsome than the culture of impunity. This iron fist must nonetheless be accompanied by a bold and determined effort to mend the broken fabric of the nation, rebuild the channels of expression and communication, gain strength, mobilize energies and establish the conditions for resumed social interaction. The international community should strive to encourage, facilitate and support this effort by giving it political, logistical and financial backing.

From this perspective, we can only welcome the establishment of the United Nations offices in Guinea-Bissau, the Central African Republic and Angola, as well as the activities of the United Nations Transitional

Administration in East Timor, for their invaluable contribution to those countries through their support for the promotion of human rights, the establishment and development of democratic institutions and the strengthening of their public administration capacities. Nevertheless, an additional effort must be made in the financial area, particularly in Africa, in order to ensure that this work continues and bears fruit.

Fourthly and finally, since development is another name for peace, it will always be necessary to establish a programme specially adapted to the needs of the country or region concerned and aimed at the rehabilitation of basic infrastructure, the construction of education and health centres, job creation and the relaunching of economic activity on a more sound and equitable basis. To that end, the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Bretton Woods institutions have an important role to play in establishing the necessary strategies and in ensuring financing, without which no action worthy of that name can be undertaken.

Indeed, it is neither by draining the meagre and steadily declining resources of UNDP, nor by turning to conventional tools and methods of intervention — much less by piecemeal efforts, improvisation and posturing — that we will provide the necessary remedies for the economic and social problems that are often at the root of conflict or that we will eliminate their causes.

In this respect, we cannot consider the formula of pledging conferences always to be the appropriate one or even ever to have registered a real success. After a war, many countries and financial institutions rush to hastily organized conferences to promise their financial support, but those commitments, unfortunately, are not always followed up by action. The case of the most recent donor conference for the Central African Republic is significant in that respect.

Special treatment for the debt of countries affected by conflict and more advantageous loan conditions might perhaps be considered by the World Bank and by the donor countries. In general terms, more generous and effective development cooperation would contribute significantly to the reduction of sources of tension and conflict. The link between peace and development, which everyone now recognizes, should encourage us to step up our efforts to give concrete form to the various commitments undertaken here at the United Nations and at other forums to help the developing countries, especially the least developed among them, to prevent the outbreak or resurgence of conflict.

In implementing its policies on the ground, the Security Council has an extremely important tool in its peacekeeping missions. The United Nations offices are another tool available to the Organization as a whole, but their mandates and means would clearly benefit from being clarified, made more specific and, we would hope, strengthened, while their resources should be enhanced. Close and effective coordination should be established between the missions and the offices in order to avoid potential overlapping and to ensure coordinated and harmonious implementation of a peace-building strategy that involves actors other than the Security Council.

Indeed, it is useful to recall that the comprehensive, complex and demanding nature of post-conflict peace-building requires an effective contribution from other bodies, such as the General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, the United Nations Secretariat and its agencies and programmes, the Bretton Woods institutions and the regional organizations concerned. In other words, a partnership for peace must be established in clarity, transparency and respect for the mandates and powers of each.

These are the thoughts that I wished to share during this consideration of peace-building, which the Council has opened to discussion at just the right moment. I hope that this exercise at collective reflection will contribute to better organized peace-building operations in the future. They are a means of preventing conflicts that is ultimately less costly than the exercise of conflict resolution and certainly more orderly and calm, given that they are neither conceived nor implemented under the threat or pressure of events.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: I thank the representative of Algeria for his kind words addressed to me, as well as for his most instructive statement.

The next speaker on my list is the representative of Nigeria, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Mbanefo (Nigeria): Let me first of all congratulate you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of

February. You can count on the support of the Nigerian delegation in the discharge of the onerous tasks ahead of you. Let me also congratulate your predecessor, Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore, for the effective manner in which he guided the affairs of the Council last month. I would also like to thank the Secretary-General for his very important statement to the Council this morning. It was very instructive.

The whole question of peacekeeping operations in with all its ramifications is an issue that is very dear to my delegation, first because of Nigeria's involvement in United Nations peacekeeping operations and secondly because of our membership in the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, of which I am honoured to be the Chairman.

Last year, a lot of energy was devoted during the Millennium Summit and the Millennium Assembly to the issue of peacekeeping operations. The report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, otherwise known as the Brahimi report, generated a lot of interest among Member States and renewed the momentum towards strengthening the capacity of United Nations peacekeeping operations. Both the Security Council and the General Assembly have respectively endorsed various recommendations of the Security Council Working Group and the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations in the Panel's report. The importance of the recommendations contained in the Brahimi report and the report of the Special Committee cannot be over-emphasized, particularly now that, in spite of the best efforts of the United Nations and other regional organizations, the theatre of conflict appears to be growing rather than diminishing.

Although sustaining peace and security for all countries and peoples has remained the central objective of the United Nations in the new millennium, as it was when the Organization was founded over half a century ago, we must recognize that there has been a shift in the nature of the threats to peace and security since the end of the cold war. Conflicts have moved from inter-State wars to intra-State wars. Where conflicts were once a result of ideological divisions of a bipolar world, they are now fuelled by ethnic and religious intolerance, political ambition and greed, which are often exacerbated by illegal trafficking in arms, gems and drugs.

In view of the complexities of the new challenges now facing our Organization, there is a need to adopt a holistic and multidisciplinary framework to tackle these challenges. Our conflict-management strategy must include a pre-conflict, intra-conflict and post-conflict framework. Our tendency to act before comprehending the dynamics of a conflict often exacerbates it. Our intervention strategy must be multilevel and multidimensional and must include proactive measures such as the establishment of early warning systems at the community, national and international levels. Also, it must include peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building strategies such as disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR).

While a universal or a global system of early warning is unlikely to emerge — as we have seen by the controversy that followed the Brahimi recommendation on the matter — there is nevertheless a need to cast our nets as wide as possible to attract all levels of input into the early warning system.

The multidimensional and multilateral character of conflicts requires the involvement of the various sectors of society, such as international organizations, State actors and non-governmental organizations. This is because there is no hegemonic power or universal institution with the autonomy, resources and motivation adequate to meet all the demands that are often faced by the managers of international peace and security.

In order for peacekeeping and peace-building to achieve their main objectives, negotiations must include a comprehensive effort to support structures that will sustain peace and create a sense of confidence in post-conflict situations. Our focus should be on addressing the socio-economic and political roots of a conflict to achieve a practical reconstruction of the State and the revitalization of the institutions of government. We should integrate economic, social and development tools into a coherent political agenda. This strategy is particularly important in countries with problems of ethnic marginalization, such as Liberia — where the United Nations opened its first post-conflict peace-building office in 1997 — Guinea-Bissau and Central Africa.

We are all aware of the vital role effective disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of combatants could play in the promotion of peace-building efforts. Consequently, to achieve this objective, sufficient resources must be made available to ensure the implementation of the DDR programmes. In addition, the former combatants must be given

occupational training and engage in income- and employment-generating projects, which would facilitate their smooth integration into civilian life. These projects could be financed through the efforts of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, international financial institutions, multilateral agencies and other partners.

Closely related to this subject is the need to ensure efficient disarmament and to combat the issue of illicit traffic in arms because of the risk this poses to any peace-building effort. We would recall that the Bamako Declaration of 30 November 2000 on trafficking in small arms and light weapons specifically recommended that Member States should put in place national coordination agencies and appropriate institutional infrastructure to help in the monitoring of the proliferation, control, circulation and trafficking in small arms and light weapons. This initiative should be supported and sustained.

Another important area requiring our attention is the need to assist countries emerging from conflict to embark on projects with a special focus on poverty eradication, rebuilding infrastructure and sustainable development. This strategy is consistent with Security Council resolution 1318 (2000), which strongly encourages the development within the United Nations system of a comprehensive and integrated strategy to address the root causes of conflict, including their economic and social dimensions.

The main consequence of any conflict situation is the generation of refugees and internally displaced persons, the majority of whom are often women and children. Given such gloomy and agonizing circumstances, our delegation believes that the resettlement of refugees will be more meaningful if it is carried out within the context of efforts to revive economic activity and repair the social fabric. This is likely to permanently resolve the problems of insecurity and social tension that are often associated with post-conflict situations.

Furthermore, States must ensure good governance and respect for human rights and the rule of law. The Nigerian delegation believes that the international community should assist countries emerging from conflict in the establishment of democratic institutions and the rule of law. Assistance should be provided to rebuild such institutions as the judiciary, police and the civil service.

We are happy to note that recently the Security Council has included peace-building components in its mandates for peacekeeping operations such as the United Nations Mission in the Central African Republic (MINURCA), the United Nations Transitional Authority in Cambodia (UNTAC) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET), just to mention a few. We are also delighted to note that peace-building programmes are being implemented in Liberia, Sierra Leone and Guinea-Bissau, among others.

As mentioned earlier, the Nigerian delegation is of the view that a peace-building strategy requires a comprehensive and integrated approach involving all international partners and local and regional actors. We are of the opinion that as soon as preparations for peacekeeping operations are undertaken, consultations should be held by the Secretariat and the Security Council with all partners with a view to devising appropriate peace-building strategies and mobilizing of necessary resources. The Security Council should hold consultations with such partners as international financial institutions and regional and subregional organizations, so as to enable it to identify the role of each participant. This will facilitate close coordination among all actors.

Finally, let me conclude by saying that even though the Security Council has the primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, present day reality makes other State and non-State actors essential to the effective achievement of international peace and security. We therefore hope that the present level of cooperation among stakeholders will be sustained.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I wish to thank the representative of Nigeria for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the Republic of Korea. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sun Joun-yung (Republic of Korea): I would like to begin by congratulating you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the Council presidency for the month of February. The subject of today's debate is both relevant and timely, especially considering the convening of the fourth United Nations regional organizations high-level meeting tomorrow to

once again take up this important issue as a part of its own agenda. In this regard, we appreciate Tunisia's initiative in requesting the Council to revisit the issue of peace-building in a comprehensive manner.

Since the complexity of new security challenges was properly pointed out by the Secretary-General in his publication "An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) in 1992 and its Supplement (S/1995/1) in 1995, much has been discussed and many new strategies have been conceived. Peacekeeping operations are adapting to the complex and multidimensional aspects of the new reality. We therefore welcome the recent tendency whereby the mandates of peacekeeping operations include post-conflict peace-building components.

During last month's open debate on strengthening cooperation with troop-contributing countries, many Member States pointed out that consultations among the main parties concerned should start at the earliest possible stage of decision-making of a peacekeeping operation. We would like to reiterate that such early arrangements would be crucial in establishing a well-planned peace-building strategy in the peacekeeping operation's mandate.

Taking this opportunity, we would like to welcome the establishment of the working group of the whole on United Nations peacekeeping operations. We expect its work to lead to systematically enhanced cooperation with the troop contributors and their participation in the decision-making process.

It is now commonly acknowledged that conflict prevention, peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building are interlinked and are more effective if pursued simultaneously, rather than sequentially. Accordingly, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants are prerequisites for immediate post-conflict stability and prevention of a conflict's recurrence. Peace, security and economic and social development are also closely interlinked. The protection of refugees and internally displaced persons is also an essential part of today's peace-building measures. Their safe return and rehabilitation are among the most basic conditions for reintegration and stability in the affected region.

Against this backdrop, I would like to make a few comments on issues to which we attach particular significance.

Above all, peacekeeping operation mandates should always be realistic and cost-effective for the success of the missions. A key factor to be taken into consideration in order to make a peace-building strategy successful is the availability of financial and other resources for a long-term strategy. When discussing the strategy for United Nations engagement in post-conflict situations, a feasible scenario must be drawn out at a very early stage to clarify the United Nations role and function.

The most cost-effective strategy would be to enhance the preventive capacity of the United Nations. In our view, the direct involvement of this Council and an enhanced role for the Secretary-General should be further encouraged for the effective management of conflicts at all levels. We believe that the Secretary-General plays an instrumental role by continuously monitoring the situation of regions with current, past and potential conflicts and by updating the Council on his findings and views. Since timeliness is a critical element in intervention, the reports of the Secretary-General must be prepared at a most pertinent juncture and be given due consideration by the Council.

We expect that the various actors, such as the United Nations funds, programmes and specialized agencies, international financial institutions, particularly the Bretton Woods institutions, and regional organizations will further enhance their efforts to systematically coordinate an integrated response. Moreover, a strengthened partnership with non-governmental organizations will contribute positively to aggregating necessary support by widening the pool of volunteer workers. However, in a situation where a variety of players from different entities get involved, due caution is necessary to avoid the duplication of work and competition for limited resources.

In this regard, we take note that the Security Council has underlined in past reports the need to clearly define tasks and divide responsibilities among all actors involved. My delegation concurs with the observation in the Brahimi report that it is necessary to establish a focal point for peace-building. In this regard, the suggestion in the report that the Under-Secretary-General for Political Affairs, as the Convener of the Executive Committee on Peace and Security (ECPS) be the focal point, merits further consideration. The strengthening of the function of ECPS will contribute to upgrading the capacity of the United Nations to forge a comprehensive strategy and to better

coordinate with other actors. My delegation also supports the ongoing efforts of the Department of Political Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme to jointly strengthen United Nations capacity in the area of peace-building.

In closing, let me underscore the role of regional organizations and the countries of the region concerned. The success of any peace-building operation may become elusive without strong political will and the support of the Member States. In particular, we believe that a more proactive engagement on the part of the countries and organizations of the affected region is crucial. Given the complexity of coordination among different players and the difficulty of mobilizing a full-scale intervention by the international community, the regional entities and countries should be encouraged to take the initiative.

We have already witnessed some cases where the courageous involvement of regional organizations and countries in peacekeeping operations facilitated the peace-building process in the affected region. These examples demonstrate the need for countries to share an enhanced sense of responsibility and cooperation in preventing conflicts and in keeping and building peace in their own regions. We hope that the upcoming high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations will yield a productive discourse on this important subject.

It is our firm belief that the assistance of the international community will be genuinely meaningful when the parties directly concerned demonstrate their commitments at a matching level.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: I thank the representative of the Republic of Korea for his kind words addressed to me.

I should like to take this opportunity to welcome, on behalf of the Council, Mr. Esmat Abdul-Maguid, the Secretary-General of the League of Arab States, who has joined us this afternoon.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Egypt. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Aboulgheit (Egypt) *(spoke in Arabic)*: First of all, I should like to say, Mr. President, that my country holds your sisterly country and people in high regard. Today, by happy coincidence, the President of Egypt, Mr. Hosni Mubarak, is visiting Tunisia — that green and beautiful country — within the framework of the constructive communication between our two peoples and our two Governments. I should like to extend to you, Sir, my thanks for organizing this important discussion, which we hope will make a further contribution to the efforts and endeavours of the United Nations on the issue under consideration.

The issue that we are discussing today is very important — indeed, it is vital. Egypt believes that the importance of the issue, with its complex elements and its multifaceted character, is such that a single United Nations body — even the Security Council — cannot deal with it in its entirety. In fact, as the Tunisian working paper that you, Mr. President, have distributed in preparation for this meeting, makes clear, the matter requires cooperation between all the main bodies of the Organization, including the General Assembly, the Security Council and the Economic and Social Council, in addition to the Secretariat, presided over by the Secretary-General, Mr. Kofi Annan, in whose leadership, wisdom and continuous efforts in the service of the Organization and its noble goals we have every confidence.

We believe that all these bodies should carry out their work, each within its own competence and in accordance with its mandate, in conformity with the Charter. In addition, the United Nations specialized agencies and their executive boards should work to fulfil these objectives.

From that perspective, I should like to deal with a number of points to which my delegation attaches great importance when discussing the issue of peace-building. First, from a theoretical point of view, it might seem that the establishment of an agreed strategy or comprehensive, joint approach to peace-building is not difficult to achieve. However, the fact is that the specifics of any individual case prevent us from committing ourselves to the idea of a joint approach that can be implemented across the board. Each case has its own specific characteristics. We believe, therefore, that during the post-conflict phases in countries and communities that have been destroyed or severely affected by conflict, the United Nations must have a large degree of flexibility so as to ensure that stereotyping does not lead to disregarding or misrepresenting some of the important elements in any particular case.

Secondly, the importance that the Security Council attaches to the issue of peace-building — an issue that, as I pointed out earlier, falls within the competence of the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council — is something for which we should be grateful to the Council. We would prefer the Security Council to give more attention to emerging or ongoing conflicts, or to situations that seem likely to erupt into full-blown conflict. We would like to see the Security Council focus on peace-building in a controlled manner as it relates to post-conflict situations so that it is not diverted from its main function of maintaining international peace and security. We should also like to emphasize how important it is for the Security Council to deal with issues without applying double standards, which often happens in the implementation of its resolutions, and to show more enthusiasm with regard to the situation in countries such as Somalia and Angola and in the Middle East. In our view, regrettably, the Security Council does not fully assume its responsibilities when it comes to the Middle East.

We believe that this is an important point, since this Council is authorized by the Member States to maintain international peace and security. It is unacceptable to allow the Security Council to fail in performing such functions, or for it to consider issues that, though recognized as being important, the Council does not have a recognized mandate to deal with or to control.

Thirdly, we noted in many cases that the failure of efforts to build peace in post-conflict situations can be attributed to the incorrect handling of a number of elements during the period in which the Council intervenes on behalf of the international community to settle the dispute and to maintain peace and security after bringing the conflict under control. A case in point is the failure in helping Angola to return to a state of peace and stability after the difficulties that the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme faced there. The fact that this programme has failed to gain the support of the opposition movement there is one of the reasons that led to the failure of the endeavours of the United Nations and to its almost total withdrawal from the Angolan scene.

Fourthly, we believe that the Council could attach the necessary importance and give the necessary follow-up to the issue of disarming combatants and reintegrating them into post-conflict societies. This is a very important element that allows — if implemented properly, as the case of Mozambique clearly shows — a whole society to reach a safe haven. The Security Council could take up a coordinating role, along with the Secretariat, the relevant agencies and bodies and the neighbouring countries, in dealing with the issue of refugees and displaced persons from the point of view of its possible impact on the continuation of a conflict or its rekindling after a period of calm. I must refer here to the oldest existing refugee issue in the world: the question of the Palestinian refugees and the imperative of settling this question with methods that are in line with international legitimacy so that it becomes a complementary element to a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East instead of being an element that prevents the reaching of any such settlement.

As for the other proposed points, such as sustainable development, the eradication of poverty, supporting the rule of law and democratic institutions, they are all matters that have a prominent position in any strategy for building peace. We could not even conceive of building a truly permanent peace in any country emerging from conflict without seriously dealing with these elements. Egypt believes that these basic matters should be dealt with through the other main bodies of the United Nations. However, the Security Council could take these very important dimensions into consideration when intervening in any conflict. Then it should work to provide the appropriate climate for restoring peace as soon as possible so that the main bodies and the specialized agencies of the Organization, regional organizations and neighbouring countries could take up their responsibility.

We do not want our Security Council to be transformed into an Economic and Social Council or into a private, miniature General Assembly, particularly since there is a high degree of politicization in its work that contradicts the nature and the working methods of the two other bodies mentioned. The mandate and competence of the Council, in accordance with the Charter, are not comprehensive; they are in fact limited. There is no doubt that this limitation of its mandate by the founding fathers of the United Nations was intentional. This intention should be upheld and respected by the Member States.

This does not mean that we are not satisfied to see the Security Council show interest in post-conflict

phases and situations and strategies for building peace. Concerning the way the Council could contribute in this domain, we believe that there is an attempt by the Council, within the framework of interpreting the text of the Charter and of dealing with the text with a large degree of flexibility, to contribute in some form towards encouraging and assisting the international community to focus on how to ensure that societies do not return once again to conflict after conflicts have been brought under control through serious effort for the maintenance of peace and security. Therefore, the Council should recommend a loose framework for how to determine the general priorities of what the other principal bodies should focus on — within the framework of their mandate and their competence, in a way that brings about some balance between these different bodies so that there is no overlapping in their functions and so that they will work towards one clear and agreed upon strategy to rebuild failed or destroyed communities after conflict or communities that have been exposed to special circumstances, such as in Kosovo and East Timor.

We believe that it is important not to forget that peace in itself is a difficult goal to attain. There are many communities and societies around the world that look to the Security Council to bring about the attainment of that objective. Somalia does not enjoy the necessary degree of attention yet. Angola, as we stated earlier, has returned to the vicious spiral of violence after 4 years of calm. And the United Nations stands before the problems in the Congo in astonishment and surprise, as if it does not have the necessary mechanisms and tools to restore stability to that vast African State.

Here I do not wish to deal with the Middle East, considering that the issue will force some members of the Council not to undertake their responsibilities, as we have seen recently.

Finally, there are many conflicts and struggles that fall within the mandate and the competence of the Council. The international community looks forward to the Council's dealing with these issues seriously and decisively so as to restore peace and stability to the world.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Egypt for the kind words he addressed to me and to my country.

The next speaker is the representative of Senegal. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Ka (Senegal) (*spoke in French*): I wish at the outset, Sir, to congratulate you on the assumption by your country, Tunisia, of the presidency of the Security Council for February. At the same time, we thank you for the timely convening of today's debate, which is explicitly setting out the challenges of peace-building and of the management of post-conflict situations.

The question of peace-building is both sensitive and complex in all its aspects, because it has two bases and, more specifically, because it rests on two pillars whose characteristics are often difficult to reconcile. They are the need, first, to safeguard the gains of a peace agreement that is supposed to put an end to a conflict and, secondly, to bring about the adoption of measures that will promote the linkages among peace, security, stability and economic and social development so as to enable communities rent asunder by conflict to regain peace, rebuild their country and restore a stable society whose members have attained reconciliation.

To be effective and credible, therefore, any approach to post-conflict peace-building should include the immediate implementation of a series of determined, consistent measures to prevent actions that could jeopardize a peace agreement and possibly lead to a resumption of hostilities. In the long term, integrated and sustainable action should follow, aimed first and foremost at the rebuilding of the conflict-ravaged country.

Finally, if it is to have any hope of success, any approach to peace-building should consider the underlying causes of the conflict, not merely its effects: in many countries at war, especially in Africa, those causes commonly include fragile political institutions, endemic poverty, colossal debt and a climate of insecurity at home and abroad.

To address all these elements, it is not only necessary to take difficult political decisions; also, Governments and the international community must manifest a strong and unequivocal commitment to become genuinely involved in long-term development activities supported by the adequate and timely provision of resources. But we are obliged to note with regret that in the majority of situations — for example in Sierra Leone, Guinea-Bissau and the Central African

Republic — neither Governments nor the international community were able to respond promptly and effectively to the needs dictated by the situations for supporting the peace-building process that had been put in place.

Mr. President, in your note entitled "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach", you rightly stressed that

> "Peace-building calls for an integrated strategy comprising a series of actions on various fronts: political, military, diplomatic, economic, social and institutional ... which together form a coherent social context". (*S/2001/82, annex*)

Meeting such a great challenge requires clear and sustained political will and synergistic efforts that are well formulated and well organized.

To construct an integrated strategy for peace-building it is necessary, first, to avoid making — as the Minister for Development Cooperation of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recently put it — an artificial division of conflicts into various stages: pre-conflict prevention; the conflict itself; and the post-conflict period. Such a division derives from a particular mind-set and bears no relation to the facts on the ground: most present-day conflicts, especially in Africa, result from institutional weakness, from power struggles and from societal fragility; these often undermine the legitimacy of Governments. These factors must be taken into account when the mandates of peacemaking and post-conflict peace-building missions are being defined.

Secondly, given its multidisciplinary nature, peace-building must be an essential element of an integrated, comprehensive approach which includes poverty reduction, promotes policies of good governance and the rule of law, and strengthens the elements of an active civil society that can provide support and advice during the peace-building phase.

Thirdly, the international financial institutions and the bilateral donor community must have a better defined involvement in peace-building, for we know that the structural adjustment programmes that accompany the economic reform process too often trigger vulnerability that can give rise to frustration and social tension which, if not carefully treated, can create a climate that can destroy peacemaking and post-conflict peace-building efforts. It is therefore important for international financial institutions and the donor community to take these dangers into account and to try as best they can to strike a just balance between the demands of macroeconomic stability and the priorities for the restoration of peace, which call for greater flexibility in allocating resources for the economic recovery of countries emerging from war.

Fourthly, a sine qua non for restoring stability to countries emerging from conflict is unquestionably the way in which former soldiers, refugees and displaced persons are treated. The highest priority should be attached to programmes of disarmament, demobilization, rehabilitation and reintegration, with a view to finding humane solutions that address the causes of conflict and that thus avoid weakening the legitimate expectations raised by the conclusion of a peace agreement. Unfortunately, the examples of Guinea-Bissau and of Sierra Leone remind us that adequate resources arrive too late.

Fifthly, if we wish to see peace built, we must also pay specific attention to the struggle against the distribution of light weapons, which often fall into the hands of outlaw groups, and we must address the issue of the orderly return of displaced persons and refugees to their country of origin. We must also tackle the living conditions of refugees in host countries, whose burden must be eased by substantial international support programmes.

Sixthly, in order to build sustainable peace, we must strive after every conflict to establish a culture of peace, tolerance, national rebirth and social equalization so as to rebuild society along more harmonious and egalitarian lines.

In making these recommendations, we cannot overemphasize the need to provide support missions for peace-building programmes with sufficient resources to allow them credibly to discharge their peacekeeping mandate.

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that peace-building is a multidimensional process. Its commendable objectives are to break cycles of violence and, above all, to contribute to the establishment of a climate of peace and sustainable development through the use of consistent strategies in various fields. Such a process clearly calls for the United Nations, and above all the Security Council, to assume the primary responsibility in the maintenance of international peace and security. This reflects the

great importance that my delegation attaches to today's debate and, in particular, to the results of the Council's deliberations.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Senegal for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Guatemala. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Rosenthal (Guatemala) (*spoke in Spanish*): My delegation has studied with the greatest interest your proposal, Sir, contained in document S/2001/82, that the Security Council address at an open meeting the item entitled "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach". We congratulate you for the initiative of convening this meeting, which we feel is very relevant to the work of the Council.

As the representative of Ireland reminded us this morning, Guatemala is one of the countries in which the United Nations has been involved in a lengthy negotiation process to resolve a domestic armed conflict, which subsequently gave rise to a peace-building and peace-consolidation effort. I would like to take this opportunity to share some of the lessons we have learned from this exercise. We do so in the full understanding that every process has distinct features that are not easily transferable to other situations. At the same time, however, each process has sufficient shared characteristics to contribute to the accumulated experience and knowledge of the United Nations in carrying out its various peace operations.

As members of this Council know, in December 1996, with the invaluable assistance of the United Nations, we brought to an end a domestic armed conflict that had raged in Guatemala for some 36 years. This confrontation took tens of thousands of human lives, gave rise to grave human rights violations and not only inflicted physical injury and other suffering on many of its victims, a large number of whom became refugees, but inevitably did serious damage to the country's economy.

The roots of the conflict are complex. They include age-old social demands on the part of some sectors of the nation that the many manifestations of social injustice be redressed. These include poverty, unequal distribution of income and property, the resultant inequality in access to services, the violation of human rights, exclusion and marginalization, and racial and gender discrimination. The conflict and the polarization that ensued over the way in which those demands were to be met were substantially intensified by the fact that the conflict in Guatemala was subjected to the tensions peculiar to the so-called cold war. Indeed, the fall of the Berlin Wall and its consequences restored a more manageable scope to the domestic conflict, which enabled the Guatemalans themselves to take the lead in the search for a way out.

Therein lies the first lesson of the Guatemalan peace process. It was not imposed from outside, but rather reflected the genuine will of the parties to the conflict and of the Guatemalan population in general to put an end to war. To use a colloquial term, it was the Guatemalans who were in the driver's seat and it was the Guatemalans who showed, and continue to show, a commitment to peace. This is undoubtedly a prerequisite to the success of any peace-building effort.

The second lesson that can be drawn from the Guatemalan peace process is in line with the comprehensive approach that your letter advocates, Mr. President. The series of agreements that were negotiated over six years address the principal sources of the dissatisfaction of many Guatemalans. The titles of some of those agreements suffice to outline the causes of this discontent. Those titles include the following: Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights; Agreement on Resettlement of the Population Groups Uprooted by the Armed Conflict; Agreement on the Establishment of the Commission to Clarify Past Human Rights Violations and Acts of Violence; Agreement on the Identity and Rights of Indigenous Peoples; Agreement on Social and Economic Aspects and the Agrarian Situation; Agreement on the Strengthening of Civilian Power and on the Role of the Armed Forces in a Democratic Society; Agreement on Constitutional Reforms and the Electoral Regime. Likewise, matters relating to disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR) are reflected in the Agreement on the Implementation, Compliance and Verification Timetable for the Peace Agreements.

Members of the Council will readily note the close correlation that exists between these peace agreements and the enumeration of various aspects of peace-building listed in part III of document S/2001/82. Taken as a whole, the commitments laid down in the Guatemalan Peace Agreements constitute a road-map showing the direction of a global effort

aimed at building and consolidating peace and that sets out the various economic, social, political and cultural aspects of this process. Moreover, those commitments have already successfully undergone an important trial by fire in that they have been accepted by all the parties as a solemn undertaking of the State. It is significant that the Government elected in December 1999, made up of the party that opposed the previous Government, made public its commitment to the Agreements.

A third lesson to be drawn from the Guatemalan experience underscores the usefulness of international support, particularly that of the United Nations. Even though the Organization was backed by a group of countries that acted as friends, it was the United Nations, in the last analysis, that projected the image of credibility, neutrality and objectivity that enabled it to play such an important role in backing the effort made by the Guatemalan people themselves to, first, achieve peace and, secondly, to build peace.

This role, had it been entrusted to any other external body, would surely have been viewed as an intrusion; yet, when fulfilled by the United Nations, it constituted the performance of a function expressly assigned to it by the parties to the conflict. And it is a function that was, and continues to be, carried out in an exemplary manner. In the first place, since 1994, the United Nations was active as a body facilitating the negotiation and conclusion of the Peace Agreements, as well as one that verified compliance with the Comprehensive Agreement on Human Rights. Thereafter, as from the entry into force of the Peace Agreements, its role encompassed the fulfilment of the totality of the undertakings laid down in those Agreements. On 19 December last, the General Assembly approved the extension of the mandate of the Verification Mission for the first year of a new phase covering the period 2001-2003.

As the fourth lesson to be drawn, it should be noted that regional bodies — another topic referred to in the Council's note — also played an important role in the process, this being true not only of the regional body *par excellence*, namely the Organization of American States (OAS). It should be recalled that a group of Latin American countries — which made up the so-called Contadora Group, and subsequently the Rio Group — sought to further the peace process throughout Central America, including, of course, the one unfolding in my country. It should also be recalled that it was the Central American Presidents, acting in unison, who adopted in Esquipulas the Framework Agreement within which the peace processes in El Salvador, Guatemala and Nicaragua were inscribed.

But, contrary to the practice that prior to 1994 had prevailed in the application of Chapter VIII of the Charter, it was the United Nations that took the lead among the multilateral bodies in dealing with the Guatemalan situation. Thus, an important new precedent was established in relations between the United Nations and the OAS.

In the fifth and final case, it is usually said that in the case of Guatemala, the application of the Peace Agreements is irreversible. But this is not necessarily so. If the people of Guatemala do not perceive that their level of material and spiritual well-being has improved as a result of those Agreements, it is still conceptually plausible that regression might occur. For that reason, the Government is bent on promoting the fulfilment of the provisions of the Agreement on Social and Economic Aspects and the Agrarian Situation. In other words, if we fail to consolidate peace, this will surely reflect the fact that the old economic and social inequities incubating throughout my country were not properly addressed, thus proving once more the inseparable interrelationship between peace and development.

These are, in a nutshell, the experiences we can bring before the Council. In closing, Mr. President, we wish once more to express our appreciation to you for having taken the initiative of organizing this meeting.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: I thank the representative of Guatemala for his kind words.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Nejad Hosseinian (Islamic Republic of Iran): Mr. President, I wish to extend my congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. We have full confidence that under your wise guidance, the Council will make progress in dealing with the issues on its agenda. Let me also extend felicitations to your predecessor, Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore, for his skilful stewardship of the Council's activities last month.

I would also like to say how pleased my delegation is to participate under your presidency in a Security Council debate on this important subject. We believe that the complexities of post-conflict peace-building and the challenges posed to the United Nations and the international community in general deserve thorough consideration.

In the post-cold war period, the dimension of United Nations activities changed significantly. Most new conflicts which started in the 1990s or continued into that decade were considered to be complex emergencies in development terms. Of the 27 major conflicts recorded in 1999, 25 were civil wars, generating a wide variety of problems for civilians and puzzlement for peaceful activists. In this context, peacekeeping operations stopped providing a buffer between two countries in combat and merely reported ceasefire violations after the opponents had decided to make peace. In the new environment they had to embark on a wide variety of complex tasks within State boundaries. In the process of dealing with the new and extremely complex situations, concepts such as preventive diplomacy, post-conflict peace-building and peace enforcement have emerged.

Extensive United Nations experience in peacekeeping, especially during the past decade, teaches us, among other things, that a ceasefire is not sufficient to ensure peaceful development in a war-torn society, and that a peacekeeping operation, even though it may be quite successful, does not completely prepare the ground and satisfy the requirements for building peace once a conflict is over. Too often we have seen hopes for a better future shattered. Too often the vicious cycle of violence has proved stronger than aspirations for peace.

Experience has also taught us how vital it is to ensure that, after conflicts, all the following conditions are met so that peace can endure. Every measure should be taken to strengthen confidence among the former parties to a conflict through dialogue, create a new climate favourable to national reconciliation and encourage the resumption of economic and social activities that improve the daily lives of a population by addressing the underlying causes of conflict.

Although each situation requires its own unique solutions, my delegation believes that there are some key principles that have general application in post-conflict peace-building. We would place timeliness of response at the top of any list of key principles. Given the importance of eliminating any possibility of a return to fighting, the effective implementation of peace-building programmes should be treated as an urgent matter. Thus, it is important to plan for post-conflict peace-building from the outset. When armed conflict is still ongoing, even before the start of a ceasefire, the needs of the societies concerned should be identified and the means for meeting them should be explored.

Measures aimed at building peace should be designed and implemented in close cooperation and consultation with those directly concerned, taking into consideration the specific conditions and needs in each particular situation. Specific requirements of the societies in question, together with their cultural characteristics, as well as the right of every State to freely choose and develop its economic, political, cultural and social systems in full freedom and in concert with basic international standards, should be taken into account.

Post-conflict peace-building activities should be carried out in full respect for the purposes of the United Nations Charter, in particular the principles of sovereign equality, political independence and non-intervention in matters that are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State. As a rule, they should be undertaken only at the request of and with the full consent of the State concerned.

The international community should give particular attention to the financing of economic recovery as part of post-conflict peace-building. Assistance in rebuilding the economic and social infrastructure, assistance in reintegration into the world economy, direct economic and financial assistance and the provision of humanitarian relief assistance are necessary for the successful reconstruction of societies emerging from war.

The early involvement of the local population in the reconstruction process and building local capacity to sustain peace in the fragile conditions of the post-conflict period should be an important focus of the international effort.

Measures towards the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants and identifying appropriate post-conflict roles for them is inevitably one of the most challenging tasks in peace-building and one of the most important keys to

avoiding the recurrence of violence and to building peace in post conflict situations. In this connection, devising, funding and implementing quick-impact projects aimed at improving quality of life and providing former combatants with a legitimate livelihood can help attain the objectives. The rapid deployment of a sufficient number of civilian police could also contribute to the return of law and order and thus to the re-emergence of an appropriate climate.

Here I wish to stress the importance of demining as one of the essential components of post-conflict peace-building. It is self-evident that the impact of anti-personnel landmines extends beyond an immediate danger to life and property to a wide array of socio-economic and developmental aspects in mine-affected countries.

Together with the aforementioned measures, there is usually an urgent need to help local communities revive and/or strengthen related rule-of-law elements and institutions. The re-establishment of a basic civil administration and a functioning legal system in a post-conflict environment, wherever the situation warrants, is among the necessary steps towards shaping governance institutions, civil society-building and effective civilian governance.

The process of peace-building requires that the United Nations play an integrated, multifaceted and more action-oriented role in order to create a climate conducive to political and economic stability in the State concerned. To this end, it is important to maintain close coordination between the two major organs of the United Nations: the General Assembly and the Security Council.

We believe that, in general, the key to better management of peace and security lies in a shared responsibility between the General Assembly and the Security Council; but when it comes to peace-building, it is beneficial to ensure a smooth transition from peacekeeping operations, which are usually established by the Security Council, to post-conflict peace-building activities under the supervision of the General Assembly.

Decisions on such activities should be entrusted primarily to the General Assembly, which could receive support from other principal organs of the United Nations and from the specialized agencies. There is no need to emphasize that the Security Council and all other United Nations organs should play a supportive role.

We also believe that the United Nations should be considered the focal point for peace-building to coordinate the many different activities and actors, including financial institutions, regional organizations and donor countries, that building peace entails. To this end, we find merit in the recommendation contained in the Brahimi report on the need for creating a consolidated and permanent institutional capacity within the United Nations system. We also support efforts under way by the Department of Political Affairs and the United Nations Development Programme to jointly strengthen United Nations capacity in this area.

We welcome the ongoing efforts of the Council to enhance the effective implementation of the arms embargoes already imposed by the Council on a number of conflicting parties throughout the world. We also commend the efforts undertaken recently aimed at putting an end to the pillaging of the national resources of nations and the diversion of the relevant benefits to the acquisition of weapons and military equipment. We believe that such measures not only facilitate peacemaking and peacekeeping efforts, but also help contain human losses and material damage in areas of conflict, thus rendering subsequent peace-building efforts less difficult and lengthy.

The Islamic Republic of Iran is following with great interest the ongoing deliberations on peace operations in the United Nations and is determined to further develop its capacity to contribute to these operations.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Japan. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Satoh (Japan): First, I would like to congratulate you, Mr. President, on assuming the leadership of the Council for the month of February and to express my sincere appreciation to you for convening this open meeting. My delegation firmly believes that it is important for issues relating to conflict prevention and peace-building to be discussed regularly in the Council, particularly at open meetings.

It is through such discussions that we will best be able to develop our ideas on this complex agenda item. These discussions can also increase awareness and understanding among Governments and other actors, including development agencies and non-governmental organizations, which could contribute to conflict prevention and peace-building efforts on the ground.

I commend you, Mr. President, for producing a useful working paper, which incorporates the fruit of past discussions and provides a basis for further progress. We also look forward to the Secretary-General's report on the prevention of armed conflict, to be submitted by May 2001, which should further facilitate our discussion.

For its part, in January 1998 in Tokyo, the Japanese Government hosted the International Conference on Preventive Strategy and, more recently, in July 2000, it chaired the G-8 Foreign Ministers' Meeting, which adopted the Miyazaki Initiatives for Conflict Prevention. We believe that the results of these meetings, which we shared with all Member States of the United Nations, were a useful contribution to this Organization's discussions.

As described in the working paper, there is already broad agreement on the need to pursue peace-building through a comprehensive and integrated approach. This involves taking appropriate steps at all stages of conflict, from the pre-conflict to the post-conflict stage, as well as addressing the root causes of conflict, including economic and social factors. The importance of involving donors, various organs and agencies of the United Nations, regional organizations and international financial institutions in a well-coordinated manner is also widely recognized.

Today I would like to emphasize a few points. We must be fully aware of the linkage between conflict and development, as was stressed not only in the Millennium Summit Declaration but also in the G-8 Miyazaki Initiatives. Peace and stability are prerequisites for sustainable economic development, and sustainable economic development fosters peace and stability by eliminating the root causes of conflict. In other words, peace-building efforts and development assistance must be mutually supportive, and, as Japan's Prime Minister, Yoshiro Mori, pointed out during his recent visit to three sub-Saharan States, the two efforts should be organically linked like the wheels of a cart.

Africa is a case in point. As Prime Minister Mori stressed during his visit to the region, it is the African region that requires this approach. The proliferation of conflicts in the region underscores the urgent need for a coherent strategy for peace-building and development. We believe that the United Nations and the broader international community should make this a priority at the beginning of this century.

Having recently witnessed the achievements of United Nations peacekeeping missions in Kosovo and East Timor, which have been given broad mandates that encompass reconstruction and capacity-building functions, we are all the more convinced that comprehensive peace-building and development efforts must be pursued in all regions of the globe.

For its part, Japan will remain committed to assisting African countries in their efforts to overcome the difficulties they face. Japan's firm commitment to a comprehensive approach to peace-building and development in that continent is reflected not only in its bilateral and multilateral development assistance but also in its sponsorship of the First and Second Tokyo International Conferences on African Development (TICAD). In the same spirit, Japan has proposed to hold ministerial-level talks on African development in Tokyo next December in preparation for a future third TICAD meeting.

It is widely acknowledged that all the relevant players must fulfil their respective roles in peace-building and development efforts. That is why Prime Minister Mori stated, during his visit to the region, that priority would be given to positioning TICAD as a forum where African nations themselves can discuss development strategies.

Lastly, I would like to stress once again that the Security Council should continue to enhance its consultations with players outside the Council. Comprehensive peace-building and development efforts that encompass economic and social dimensions cannot be pursued without the cooperation of donor countries and various agencies and institutions. This point was underscored by the active participation in the recent open debate on East Timor of non-Council members which are substantially involved in the issue, as well as the United Nations Development Programme, the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund. We hope that the Council will continue this practice.

The President: I thank the representative of Japan for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Romania. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Ducaru (Romania): It is my great pleasure to congratulate you, Ambassador Saïd Ben Mustapha, on taking over the presidency of the Security Council, and to warmly welcome this initiative to continue the practice of broader debates open to States that are not members of the Council. In the same spirit, I would like to extend warm congratulations to Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore on the dynamic and efficient manner in which he managed the work of the Security Council during the month of January.

I would also like to commend the wise choice of an issue which goes to the core of the United Nations, namely, that of peace-building, and to say that we appreciate the value of the policy papers with which we were provided by the presidency.

While we associated ourselves with the European Union statement on this matter, we would like to add some considerations inspired by our own experience.

We all have a common agenda: to make sure that the world is safer, that new conflicts are prevented and that existing conflicts are contained and brought to a negotiated settlement. Romania shares the vision, expressed in the United Nations documents before us and highlighted by Secretary-General Kofi Annan this morning, that the concept of peace-building does not apply only to post-conflict situations but covers a continuum which links conflict prevention, peacemaking, peacekeeping and post-conflict rehabilitation. That is why an integrated approach is required in this respect — an approach that enables the international community to cope with the deepest causes of conflicts, which often lie in the deficit of democracy and in underdevelopment.

Romania started its current Chairmanship-in-Office of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) from the following premise: the security relationship between the United Nations and Europe has become more knotted than ever before. What is new in Europe is the emergence of a variety of actual and potential conflict situations that require full cooperation and a shared sense of purpose and of direction among the main organizations and institutions actively playing a role in the European area. The involvement of the United Nations in a continent that boasts the most sophisticated security alliance in history might seem paradoxical. Yet this decade has taught us that security can be jeopardized in many ways short of military attack, and preserving it requires more than military capabilities. The United Nations offers tools and experience in conflict prevention and post-conflict peace-building that are of great relevance for European needs today. At the same time, many of Europe's security institutions, starting with the OSCE, may provide best practices for the United Nations itself and for other regions. The idea of a coordinating meeting bringing together the executives representing the United Nations, the OSCE, the European Union, the Council of Europe and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, for example, on the theme of lessons learned in Balkans could be instrumental in order to enhance complementarity and synergy for greater coherence in policies and to develop effective networking, communication and information flows among them.

What we need is a comprehensive approach that takes all policies into account. Allow me in this respect to mention some priorities that could, in our view, be seen in their entirety as important guidelines for concrete exercises on peace-building.

The first priority is to keep the human dimension ever on top, including the protection of national and other minorities, the elimination of any kind of discrimination, coping with new threats — such as organized crime, trafficking in human beings and children in armed conflict — and the integration of refugees and displaced persons. Consequently, respect for human rights must be seen as a permanent and crucial dimension of any peace-building effort.

The second priority is to properly address the economic and environmental issues which are often the underlying reason for political instability. Any peace-building endeavour should start by identifying potential economic or environmental trouble spots and, on this basis, should continue by mobilizing States and other national or transnational actors to take the appropriate steps. In this respect, proper data, expert advice and unbiased views coming from any organization with competence in this area are welcome and should complement each other.

The third priority is to increase cooperation with non-governmental organizations. Their capabilities, mostly in terms of human resources, and the dedication of their staff often fill the gap between abstract political tasks set by the political and economic international organizations and the needs of real people in the field, who are so often paying the largest share of the toll of conflicts triggered by their leaders' ambitions.

The fourth priority is to approach any local conflict from a broader regional and international perspective. Each conflict is unique and raises unique problems; there are, however, regional conditions that none can ignore. Only a regional perspective can ensure the much-needed integrated and consistent approach to peace-building activities.

The fifth priority is to promote proactive and preventive diplomacy. One cannot repeat enough that prevention is cheaper than cure. As seen in the Balkans, Caucasus or elsewhere, most current conflicts have long historical roots. While trying to build peace for today, we should avoid sowing the seeds of future conflicts or wars.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Romania for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Mongolia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Enkhsaikhan (Mongolia): Allow me at the outset to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month. I wish to express my delegation's appreciation to the Council for organizing this open debate on this topic prior to the fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations, which will also consider the issue of peace-building.

In more than half a century of United Nations existence, the world Organization has largely been successful in mediating or contributing to the cessation of wars and conflicts in various parts of the world. Yet with the change of the nature of conflicts today, it is facing immense difficulties in meeting the challenge of averting, ending and healing intra-State conflicts, the viciousness and brutality of which have shocked the world community time and again. Our commitment under the Charter "to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war" obliges us to enhance the Organization's capacity in this particular area, especially in view of the inseparable link between conflict prevention and peace-building.

The report of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations, chaired by Ambassador Brahimi, identified sound peace-building strategy as one of the key conditions for the success of complex peace operations and presented forthright recommendations for change. The Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations, on its part, emphasized the necessity of incorporating elements of peace-building into the mandates of complex operations.

Thus, there is an array of measures that need to be seriously considered to improve the United Nations capacity to build peace and make it sustainable. The working paper presented by you, Mr. President, entitled "Peace-building: towards a comprehensive approach" has reflected the major elements without which peace-building would not be feasible, or even possible. The Secretary-General, in his address this morning, also clearly underlined the major areas where attention should be focused. Thus, tackling the issues of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants is essential for post-conflict peace-building. In this respect, in our view, the positive outcome of the Conference on the Illicit Trade in Small Arms and Light Weapons in All Its Aspects is crucial. It is to be hoped that the final document of the Conference will reflect the concerns expressed by the international community and recommendations to be proposed by the high-level meeting.

We also underline the importance of the successful reintegration of rival factions in post-war society for peace to be durable. This requires concerted efforts to restore and reinvigorate economic and social institutions. The efforts to relieve the plight of refugees and displaced persons need to be undertaken in the context of the efforts to repair the social fabric and to bring justice, as well as to restore economic activity. My delegation agrees that broader efforts to strengthen governance institutions and the rule of law are also necessary for ensuring lasting peace in post-war societies.

Although post-war conflicts of the past half century are framed as conflicts of ideology, identity and religion, in many cases their root causes lie in unpalatable poverty, unjust economic and political

arrangements, massive arms trade, inequality, failed Governments and misuse of power, as well as disputes over natural resources that in many instances involve powerful interests of external stakeholders.

The Millennium Declaration underpinned the concerted will of the international community to address those issues, and this meeting provides us with an exceptional opportunity to complement that willingness with the search for effective tools to do the work.

Peace-building is not a traditional foreign-policy or military issue. However, it is obvious that lasting peace cannot be enjoyed even by the rich in a world full of discontented poor. Studies conducted by the World Bank back in 1996 highlighted the direct correlation between poverty and conflict. The Bank noted that 15 of the 20 least developed countries in the world have been involved in major violent conflicts, and that more than half of all low-income countries were involved in major civil conflicts between 1980 and 1995. Thus, pursuit of the goal of eradicating poverty by such organizations as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank and the World Trade Organization can be an important element of, and a contribution to, lasting peace and stability.

These efforts, however, would be more tangible if they were supported by confidence-building within specific regions and subregions. Regional organizations are vested with powers to deal with matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security. Thus, the efforts of those organizations should go beyond confidence-building. Their efforts should seek to enhance regional capacities for preventive diplomacy, peacekeeping and peace enforcement. My delegation would like to underline that, in its view, there is a need for a clearer vision and division of the roles of the United Nations and regional organizations in peacekeeping and peace-building. The regional organizations, in our view, should engage more broadly in consultations with the Security Council on matters pertaining to prevention and regional peace-building. That message should be underlined at the fourth high-level meeting between the United Nations and regional organizations.

Besides the involvement of regional organizations, that of civil society, as the Secretary-General underlined earlier today, is important. As current conflicts involve a multiplicity of formal and informal actors, the potential contribution of such significant players as the media, non-governmental organizations and religious organizations need to be channeled into peace-building. Thus, in our view, an added emphasis by the United Nations and the international community on strengthening and promoting local capacities for resolving conflict would contribute to long-term peace-building. This might include ways to strengthen the positive role of local media organizations in conflict-prone societies and to enhance dialogue between various non-governmental organizations, religious organizations and business circles in the early stages of conflict prevention.

While other institutions have an important role to play in peace-building, the United Nations is clearly expected to play a critical role as the coordinator of action to prevent and pre-empt violent conflicts, as is clear from today's debate here in the Council. We therefore should ensure that the United Nations is equipped with sufficient resources to effectively plan and carry out preventive measures. That question has yet to be specifically addressed; political will be needed. The prevention of conflicts also depends directly on the ability to correctly analyse the dynamics of events in a society and the root causes of tension within it. Therefore, the United Nations should develop, together with the relevant regional organizations, an adequate capacity to analyse the causes of conflict and should propose early action to prevent tension from escalating into violence.

In conclusion, allow me to express my delegation's support for efforts aimed at further enhancing the effectiveness of the United Nations and its bodies in the area of peace-building. The Security Council, which possesses primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, can and should act as a catalyst for international efforts in this area.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Mongolia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of India. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Pal (India): It is not only a pleasure, but also very reassuring, to see you, the representative of a leading member of the Non-Aligned Movement, presiding over the Security Council as it considers

what its role might be in an area of the work of the United Nations where the clear view of the non-aligned is that most of what post-conflict peace-building involves lies outside the mandate of the Council, and properly within the purview of the General Assembly. May I also take this opportunity to congratulate Singapore very warmly on the outstanding work it did during its presidency; the credit for this goes to Ambassador Mahbubani and his dedicated staff.

In a detailed statement when the Council discussed this matter in 1998, we set out the reasons why it would do more harm than good if the Security Council trespassed on the mandate of others. Those arguments remain valid, and I will not repeat them. We would be glad to send copies of our statement to Council members who want to refresh their memories.

As the cold war showed, conflicts might end and peace-building begin without the Council's being involved. The huge challenges that the countries in transition in Central and Eastern Europe now face have their roots in that conflict, and they are identical to the priorities the United Nations lists for post-conflict societies: putting in place representative systems of governance, building an inclusive society, setting up a liberal economy, and coping with the difficulties of demobilization. The countries in transition need, and have received, special attention from the entire United Nations system; the one body not engaged in post-conflict peace-building there is the Security Council, which has, prudently and correctly, kept its distance.

Where the Council has helped settle conflicts, or where the United Nations is asked to monitor peace agreements negotiated by others, it has a role to play in setting up the peacekeeping operations which are part of the process of building peace. But it does not follow that these must take on the work of economic and social reconstruction, or that the Security Council should ask them to do so. Much has been said of the new peacekeeping and of how it is completely different from the old, but this ignores facts. Consider the operations now in place. Some points become clear: the majority are still groups of observers or formed contingents observing a truce, even if they are deployed within a single country; the operations in Georgia and Tajikistan are cases in point.

Major operations such as United Nations Interim Force in Lebanon (UNIFIL) and the United Nations Mission in Ethiopia and Eritrea (UNMEE) might have thousands of troops, but they are deployed in thin bands across a border to monitor a withdrawal and a ceasefire. They have no other mandate, and, being where they are, obviously cannot possibly take on economic, social or other tasks, or even advise on them, such local knowledge as they gather being limited to the borders they police.

Even new operations within a single country, such as the one contemplated for the Congo, the United Nations Organization Mission in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (MONUC), would be deployed very selectively. MONUC would have little information about what was happening in the rest of that vast country, would find it very hard to discharge even the military mandate it has been given, and would be in no position to do anything else.

The United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL), the United Nations Interim Administration Mission in Kosovo (UNMIK) and the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET) are the three exceptions in recent years to this rule.

Trying to draw general conclusions from these very exceptional cases is dangerous and was one of the more serious shortcomings of the Brahimi report. In Kosovo and East Timor, the United Nations runs transitional administrations, as it does not and should not in other post-conflict situations. Speaking here on November 29 last year on the lessons for post-conflict peace-building to be learnt from the United Nations experience in Guinea-Bissau, the Secretary-General said that, in devising mandates for peace-building missions or revising the mandates or exit strategies for existing ones, the Council should bear in mind that Governments in post-conflict situations might be weak and not able to take action which should normally be undertaken by a sovereign Government. This is what the United Nations does in Kosovo and East Timor, where it took over in a vacuum. Where a Government is in place, no matter how weak, the United Nations should do nothing to give the impression that the Government is a cipher and that authority resides in the peacekeeping operation. That will undermine, not build, peace.

The Secretary-General also asked for more flexible financial arrangements for post-conflict situations, and he asked the Council to support the Brahimi recommendation that a percentage of a

mission's initial budget be set aside to fund quick-impact projects. We understand what the Secretary-General has in mind. Indeed, wherever Indian troops have been deployed, they help the local communities with practical projects, digging wells and building schools and roads, as the Council's mission to Sierra Leone has seen. Our troops are trained to take on projects in aid of civil authority and they respond to local needs, expressed to them by community leaders. It is another thing entirely for projects to be conceived and funded from New York, which might seem attractive, but be either unsuitable or unsustainable.

In fact, in the debate on East Timor in the Council on 26 January, the representative of the International Monetary Fund (IMF) made this very point. Donors were being generous because East Timor was a high-profile undertaking, but he warned, as others have before him, that when interest faded, what may be beneficial today may be too costly tomorrow. And on flexible funding, the Council will remember that what Mr. Sergio Vieira de Mello called a "cruel budget", the IMF representative described as realistic.

Clearly there are hard choices to be made, but the Security Council is not the place to make them. It does not have the mandate or the expertise to decide these issues, and if major extra financial provisions were built into the budgets of peacekeeping operations, these would be funded through assessed contributions. There are several regions where countries recovering from conflict border others teetering on the brink. It would be unjust and self-defeating for the post-conflict country to have its development paid for through assessed contributions because the Council had mandated it, while, for very much the same needs, its neighbours, in very much the same desperate circumstances, had to scramble for a share of a shrinking global official development assistance. Blatantly unequal treatment, within countries as between them, does not build peace – it breeds conflict.

The dark side of what the United Nations does in Kosovo and East Timor is Iraq. There too, though there is a Government in place, it is the United Nations that determines local needs and how they shall be met. The oil-for-food programme is post-conflict peace-building of sorts, but no one — neither the Secretariat, nor the Brahimi Panel, nor the vast literature on this subject – ever refers to the United Nations experiment in Iraq as a precedent to follow. But if Iraq is sui generis, so too are Kosovo and East Timor.

It is not that the Council has no role at all. Members of the Council can help in some ways in post-conflict peace-building. In disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, which peacekeeping operations are expected to supervise, experience has shown that armed gangs do not hand over the weapons without which they might be lynched by those they have terrorized or be unable to force others to give them food and shelter. For disarmament, demobilization and reintegration to succeed, the peacekeeping force must be so visibly strong on arrival that all parties to the conflict realize that it has the means of protecting them if they surrender their weapons and can overwhelm anyone foolhardy enough to try to take it on. Unfortunately, the Council almost never authorizes this, and its frugality has been shown to be a disastrous and false economy.

Secondly, most conflicts are still fought with small arms and light weapons. Effective arms embargoes are one way of reducing the risk of conflicts being resumed, but members of the Council have a larger role here. Some of them are the principal manufacturers and exporters of these weapons; they must ensure that arms are not exported from their territories to States, non-state actors, terrorists or rebel groups that use violence against legitimate Governments.

Finally, the instrument the Council uses for post-conflict peace-building is the peacekeeping operation, but it is the Secretariat that chooses the troop contributors. Because the peacekeepers play so important a role, the Council needs to give some thought to this. Some standard and minimum requirements must be laid down, and these must be both professional and political. The Serbian Special Police are quite effective in what they do, but the United Nations has not deployed them as civilian police in East Timor, nor has it tried to legitimize the former East Timorese militias by offering them jobs in the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor. This is natural; the United Nations can promote democracy, respect for civilian authority, the peaceful resolution of disputes and national reconciliation only through peacekeeping forces who understand, from national experience, what all this means. It would be a travesty, for instance, and an insult to promote post-conflict peace-building in Sierra Leone through peacekeepers who overthrow democracies at home.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of India for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Cappagli (Argentina) (*spoke in Spanish*): I should like to begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for February and for your initiative of convening on open debate on such a complex and vital issue as that of peace-building. We also wish to thank you for the drafting of the document before us, which I believe is a very good basis for this exchange of ideas.

I also wish to congratulate the Permanent Representative of Singapore, Ambassador Mabhubani, and his delegation for their excellent guidance of the work of the Security Council in January.

Argentina attaches special importance to all issues relating to peacekeeping. It is our understanding that, in the framework of providing a comprehensive approach to conflicts, the concept of peace-building complements the traditional idea of peacekeeping.

By virtue of resolution 1318 (2000) of 7 September 2000, which was an outcome of the Millennium Summit, the Security Council pledged to improve the effectiveness of the United Nations in considering conflicts at all their stages, ranging from prevention to settlement and post-conflict peace-building, and it encouraged the formulation of broad and comprehensive strategies aimed at remedying the fundamental causes of conflict, including their economic and social dimensions.

For its part, the Millennium Declaration, adopted by the General Assembly, decided to enhance the effectiveness of the United Nations in the maintenance of peace and security by providing the Organization with the resources and the instruments that it needs for its tasks of conflict prevention, peaceful settlement of disputes, peacekeeping and post-conflict peace-building and reconstruction.

The evolution of the concept of peace-building has demonstrated the close relationship between this concept and conflict prevention. Viewed from this angle, what we call peace-building is aimed on the one hand at eliminating the deep-rooted causes of a given conflict and, on the other hand, at adopting a range of different types of measures to prevent the outbreak of a conflict. Currently the elements of peace-building are present in all peacekeeping initiatives. The international community has understood that a lasting peace must be accompanied by an extended complex and effective process following the conflict. Peace-building is essentially a political process, taking into account its objectives.

The challenge of implementing a strategy of this type requires, in every specific case, a coordinated effort on the part of the international community in the preparation of a range of different types of measures: political, diplomatic, economic, social and institutional. This range of measures can be implemented only if there is political will and a commitment on the part of the international community to do so through both the United Nations system and the competent regional organizations in each case.

The components of a strategy would include the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of ex-combatants, the situation of refugees and displaced persons, the eradication of poverty, the promotion of sustainable development, the protection of human rights and the strengthening of the rule of law and of democratic institutions. From this standpoint, my country attaches special importance to the promotion of development and of human rights, for we understand this to be the greatest contribution that can be made by the international system to prevent future conflicts.

In his statement at the Millennium Summit, my country's head of State, Mr. Fernando de la Rúa, emphasized the close relationship between development and peace. He said, "poverty elimination is a fundamental factor in conflict prevention". (*A/55/PV.6, p. 13*). He went on to say that it was necessary that countries become aware of that relationship in order to refine a system of conflict resolution in keeping with the new international setting.

For Argentina, the most efficient way of preventing conflicts is to tackle their real causes. In this context, we understand the eradication of poverty to be one of the principal responsibilities of the United Nations in this century. In other words, we seek a reaffirmation of the role of development in all of its dimensions. At the same time, we understand that the promotion of pluralistic and tolerant societies that ensure the protection of human rights and that are non-

discriminatory and respectful of political, ethnic or religious minorities creates a natural barrier to the outbreak of new conflicts.

Any strategy for peace-building that is not structured around these fundamental concepts could fall short when it comes to acting on the real causes of conflicts. This could even affect confidence in the United Nations system and its future involvement in a given region. Likewise, the coordinated participation of all competent international actors should be encouraged, with special emphasis on the regional organizations, international financial organizations and the States affected. In this respect, we hope that the meetings with the regional organizations that will be starting tomorrow will benefit current and future processes.

The development of a comprehensive strategy should take into account the specifics of each concrete case. It is our understanding that in peace-building, no conflict is the same as another, and it is only through a clear understanding of the causes of a conflict that it will be possible to prepare a strategy for peace-building. As was mentioned in "An Agenda for Peace" in 1992, "Preventive steps must be based on timely and accurate knowledge of the facts." (*S/24111, para. 25*)

Lastly, it would be appropriate to analyse the Security Council's role in the peace-building process. The Presidential Statement of 30 November 1999 recognized the importance of building a culture of prevention of armed conflicts and the need for all the principal bodies of the United Nations to contribute in this regard. Likewise, on that occasion, the Council emphasized its ongoing commitment to deal with the prevention of armed conflicts in all parts of the world, and it recognized the important role played by regional organizations and arrangements in conflict prevention.

In recent years, and in the exercise of its competence in the peace-building process, the Security Council has incorporated elements in some peacekeeping mandates that relate to the peace-building process. In other cases, peacekeeping missions have been succeeded by United Nations support offices for peace-building programmes; such cases are Liberia, the Central African Republic, Guinea-Bissau and Haiti.

In any event, it should be pointed out that the Security Council has an important role to play in these peace-building processes — a role of coordinating the work of the many players that participate in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of effort and to maximize efficiency.

The preservation of peace by its very nature is a long-standing process that requires from the international community an action that is sustained over time, sufficient resources and a shared and coordinated political will. In this joint effort, we must not lose sight of the priorities of the affected States. The success of a peace-building strategy will depend on the will of the States concerned to participate, on the level of coordination of those involved and on the availability of the needed resources.

The President *(spoke in Arabic)*: I thank the representative of Argentina for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of Malaysia, whom I invite to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Hasmy (Malaysia): My delegation congratulates you, Mr. President, on your assumption of the presidency of the Council for this month and pays tribute to your predecessor, Ambassador Kishore Mahbubani of Singapore, for his outstanding leadership of the Council last month.

We commend you on your timely initiative in convening this meeting of the Council on this important subject, coinciding with the fourth high-level meeting at United Nations Headquarters between the United Nations and regional organizations. I trust that our deliberations today will provide useful inputs to this high-level meeting, particularly in the context of the supportive but important roles of regional organizations vis-à-vis the United Nations in the area of peace-building.

We all recognize the integral relationship between the maintenance of international peace and security, on the one hand, and peace-building, on the other. There is clearly a need for a more integrated, holistic approach in dealing with the two processes. Indeed, in a fragmented approach to dealing with peacemaking, peacekeeping, economic development, humanitarian assistance, refugees and institution-building — which are all important aspects of peace-building — the various components can sometimes work at cross purposes with each other, resulting in petty bureaucratic rivalries and jealousies and turf battles, when none should exist at all. These components must

be glued together through a coordination of efforts and a pooling of resources if they are to make a real impact on the ground.

Not just the Security Council, but the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) also have their own important roles in the area of peace-building. Given the comprehensive nature of peace and the integral relationship between peacekeeping, peacemaking and peace-building, there should be increased consultations and coordination between the Council, the Assembly and ECOSOC, without prejudice to the competence of other organs and agencies of the United Nations. We are encouraged by this trend, as shown in the case of the United Nations involvement in Haiti that evolved from the United Nations Civilian Police Mission in Haiti to the International Civilian Support Mission in Haiti, which we hope will be a model for United Nations involvement in other conflict situations in the future.

A concrete action by the Council in the area of peace-building is, obviously, to strengthen further the post-conflict peace-building components of peacekeeping operations, thereby increasing the multidimensional character of these operations by co-opting expertise and resources not only from troop-contributing countries, but also from relevant United Nations and other international agencies, including non-governmental organizations operating in the area of peace-building and related activities. This could be more effectively done through consultations between the Council and all other relevant organs of the United Nations, such as ECOSOC, and other relevant international agencies such as the World Bank, when a peacekeeping operation is being designed or revised, in much the same way the Council traditionally consults with troop-contributing countries.

During these consultations there will be identification of areas of responsibility between the core elements of peacekeeping that belong to the Council, and the equally important elements of peace-building, particularly in the post-conflict period, that more appropriately belong to other United Nations organs, such as ECOSOC. Such close consultations will allow for enhanced coordination of their respective programmes and activities on the ground and a seamless transition from one phase of the international presence to another.

We believe the Security Council can be a catalyst in enhancing interest in, and securing commitment to, peace-building, particularly post-conflict peace-building, by convening more open meetings in this Chamber focusing on, inter alia, peace-building efforts in conflict situations. Indeed, this has been done on a number of occasions in the past. My delegation would encourage further such meetings, focusing not only on the need for sustained political/diplomatic support for the peace process in a specific conflict situation, but also on the peace-building needs of the war-ravaged country concerned. Such an open meeting would afford the opportunity for the international community to appreciate the pressing needs of the people concerned directly from their representative, the Secretariat and the relevant United Nations agencies, as well as from other international agencies that may be invited to participate in these meetings.

Such meetings in the Council relating to aspects of peace-building need not be at the expense of other United Nations organs, as similar deliberations on specific situations could take place in the General Assembly or ECOSOC, perhaps in close coordination with, and including appropriate inputs from, the Security Council, thereby making more tangible the cooperation among these important organs of the United Nations.

Consultations and coordination between the Security Council and ECOSOC in particular could perhaps be effected through joint meetings of their respective working groups. Indeed, on appropriate occasions, it may not be inconceivable to have joint meetings of the two Councils themselves to effect even greater cooperation between them, if their rules of procedure could be made more flexible. After all, they are masters of their own procedures. Indeed, the basis for close cooperation and interaction between the Security Council and ECOSOC already exists in Article 65 of the Charter, which we feel should be more frequently invoked. The United Nations must find creative and innovative ways of doing its work and not allow itself to be constrained by restrictive procedures or antiquated ways of doing things.

Coordinating peacekeeping and peace-building activities and assisting a country by moving it from a conflict situation to peace-building require strong and effective leadership on the part of the United Nations. The overall coordinator, of course, is the Secretary-General himself, but he needs to be assisted by a

number of special representatives, coordinators, transitional administrators or other high representatives who he entrusts to carry out important tasks in the field.

Clearly, in the face of more complex operations in the field, this system must be further strengthened with adequate resources, through the appointment of highly competent and skilled United Nations officials to assist the Secretary-General in dealing with the various important actors. These would include the Governments concerned, the relevant United Nations agencies, the World Bank and other international financial and funding institutions, as well as non-governmental organizations and the private sector that have programmes on the ground. Clearly, there is a role here for skilful personal diplomacy on the part of the Secretary-General, as well as on the part of the representatives he appoints; hence the importance of these appointments.

Peacekeeping operations alone do not guarantee peace-building, which requires an integrated and multifaceted approach. While peacekeeping operations are aimed at creating an atmosphere of stability in the short term, it is imperative that other measures be instituted to address the post-conflict situation in the medium and longer terms.

An important measure, which has now become an indispensable component of current peacekeeping operations, is the programme to disarm, demobilize and reintegrate former combatants. Without the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration programme, or DDR for short, there is always the risk of a return to conflict when the presence of alienated and disgruntled ex-combatants and easy availability of arms can create a highly volatile situation. Some aspects of DDR go beyond traditional peacekeeping; hence the importance of an integrated approach to peacekeeping operations and the need to co-opt other actors in the broader context of peace-building.

The DDR programme is a potent instrument for peace-building in that, when successfully implemented, it will prevent a slide back to conflict. It should therefore be strongly supported and strengthened with the necessary funding by the international community. Indeed, with DDR, as with all other aspects of peacekeeping and peace-building, adequate funding is crucial to the entire exercise. The issue of funding therefore must be seriously addressed by all concerned.

It is not easy to draw a distinction between peacekeeping and peace-building. In addition, while some peace-building activities might occur only after a peacekeeping operation ends, they also might well be part of the peace accord which the peacekeeping mission is intended to support. Peace-building does not always start where peacekeeping stops. Peace-building is a long-term process, lasting many years after a conflict has ended. There is always a grey area or an unavoidable overlap between them; hence the importance of close coordination between the two processes.

The lack of continuity between the different stages of international action after a conflict can do great damage to the effectiveness of peace-building actions, in particular following the completion of an operation's mandate. An appropriate transition must be planned when the Security Council decides on the ending of an operation. This strategy must be in place in order to avoid an interruption of programmes or the substitution of new partners that have a different approach from that which was followed previously. The Security Council had this in mind when it deliberated on the topic "No exit without strategy" under the presidency of the Netherlands last year.

In conclusion, my delegation looks forward to concrete follow-up actions to this debate if we are serious about making peace-building an important business of the United Nations. Many ideas have been discussed and suggestions made today; many other ideas were offered by the Secretary-General in his statement this morning, in addition to those in reports that he has submitted to the Security Council and the General Assembly. The time has come for us to take up the challenge and to move from generalities to concrete action. If this happens soon, this open meeting of the Council, under your presidency, Sir, will have served its purpose. Otherwise, this debate, like some others in the past, will add to the burden of inaction which, I am sorry to say, has sometimes characterized the workings of our Organization.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Malaysia for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker inscribed on my list is the representative of New Zealand. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. MacKay (New Zealand): Let me begin by congratulating you, Sir, on assuming the presidency and by offering my best wishes for your term of office. Let me also applaud your initiative in convening, so early in your term, this open debate on peace-building. We welcome the opportunity to discuss this important subject at an open meeting of the Council.

In the Council's open debate on this issue in March last year, my predecessor noted that the complexities and challenges of peace-building deserved thorough consideration in this forum. It is reassuring that the Council remains actively seized of this issue.

There is growing recognition that peace-building is an essential part of the work of this Organization, and, indeed, the level of participation in this debate attests to that. But we also acknowledge the Secretary-General's call this morning to further increase the profile of peace-building. Half, or more than half, of United Nations peacekeeping operations now involve an element of peace-building; indeed, in many cases, trying to keep the peace without taking further steps to cement peace and reduce the chance of the conflict resuming would simply fail to address the problem and would be an inefficient use of scarce resources. Peace-building is currently playing an essential role in peace operations in my own region: in East Timor; in the Papua New Guinea island of Bougainville, where the United Nations maintains a Political Office; and in Solomon Islands, where an International Peace Monitoring Team has been deployed under the terms of the Townsville Peace Agreement.

New Zealand welcomed the fine work of Ambassador Brahimi and his Panel, including their focus on peace-building. The Panel noted that for peace-building to be effective, active, multidimensional engagement with local parties is essential. Meaningful interaction with civil society, instituting and upholding democratic norms, the effective use of United Nations civilian police and the protection and promotion of human rights are all required if peace-building is to be effective. The Brahimi Panel's recommendations on these issues are extremely useful.

We were also heartened by the support of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations for exploring the Panel's recommendation that a small percentage of a peacekeeping mission's first-year budget be made available to heads of mission to fund quick impact projects targeted at enhancing peace mission effectiveness. The importance of such projects in achieving support among local communities for peace operations and reconciliation cannot be overestimated. We also support the Committee's recommendation that programmes for disarmament, demobilization and reintegration be provided with adequate and timely resources.

We welcome the extension of the mandate of the United Nations Transitional Administration in East Timor (UNTAET). The East Timor operation clearly demonstrates the complexity of peace-building in practice, and the relevance of the Brahimi Panel's findings. While a great deal has been achieved in the humanitarian and security fields, further progress is needed in the peace-building side of the operation — for example, the greater transfer of authority to the East Timorese themselves, the establishment of the East Timor Defence Force and the effective functioning of the legal and judicial systems. New Zealand encourages UNTAET in its continuing efforts to build upon its achievements and address these areas, and stands ready to provide ongoing assistance. The granting of greater flexibility in the use of the UNTAET budget to the Secretary-General's Special Representative, Mr. Vieira de Mello, would facilitate progress in these areas.

Recent days have brought news of positive developments in negotiations between the Papua New Guinea Government and the people of Bougainville. New Zealand welcomes these wholeheartedly. The success so far of the Bougainville peace process not only demonstrates goodwill on the part of the former parties to the conflict and the importance of communities taking responsibility for working together to resolve their differences, but also underlines the importance of peace-building, through the demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, the restoration of civil authority and the focusing of donor efforts on rebuilding Bougainville's economy. Efforts in the these areas have been crucial in establishing the foundations for a lasting peace. It is worth noting that local and international non-governmental organizations have played key roles. New Zealand and other donors have been able to support peace-building efforts through the targeting of assistance to quick impact projects, including New Zealand Volunteer Service Abroad's work in retraining former combatants.

In Solomon Islands, the provision of an international team to assist with disarmament has resulted in some progress with regard to the return of weapons. Nevertheless significant challenges remain, and the will of the combatants themselves to support the peace process is of critical importance.

The work of the Brahimi Panel, the report (A/C.4/55/6) of the Special Committee on Peacekeeping Operations and the continuing focus on this topic in this forum present the international community with opportunities to reflect on the way we address post-conflict situations with a view to improving the outcomes for those involved in and affected by the conflict, and also for peacekeeping in general. Last year, New Zealand non-governmental organizations organized a seminar entitled "Peace and Security in the New Millennium: How Can New Zealand Contribute?" The seminar proceedings covered a wide range of relevant issues and noted that

> "Prevention of war ... is a multi-faceted exercise, and it requires patience and collaboration across sectors in our own society, within our region and ... internationally".

Despite our best efforts at conflict prevention — and we could always do better — there will be times when the international community has to pick up the pieces following war. When this happens, we should be prepared not only to preside over newly arrived-at peace, but we must also continue to be prepared to adopt a broad, multidimensional approach to ensure that the peace arrived at is sustainable and that the resumption of the conflict is prevented.

We encourage the Organization to continue to find innovative ways to enable peacekeeping operations to address the broader needs of peace-building. We believe this will require the General Assembly to grant greater authority and more flexibility to heads of peacekeeping operations so that they can administer their budgets in a way that maximizes their responsiveness to local needs, thus enhancing the prospects for lasting peace.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of New Zealand for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Croatia. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Šimonović (Croatia): I thank you, Mr. President, for organizing today's open debate. I wish also to commend you for following the example set by your predecessor, Singapore, and circulating a background document for today's debate. I hope that such a procedure will be endorsed as a common practice by future Presidents of the Council.

I found the document helpful, but most of all enticing, as it spelled out clearly the twofold objectives of today's debate: to reaffirm the political will of the international community and to make progress towards defining a common approach to peace-building.

It has been proved time and again, by the recurrence of conflicts in Asia, Africa and Europe, that the costs of not engaging in a timely and comprehensive manner in peace-building can quickly outpace the costs of investments in peace. Relatedly, engaging only in a selective few peace-building activities or in a discontinuous fashion can also be proved to outweigh the costs of devising and executing a comprehensive and sustained effort in peace-building. Finally, in terms of cost bearers, in the era of the globalization of markets in goods, services and, increasingly, labour, one can argue that costs of non-intervention in peace-building are borne by both the post-conflict society and the international community. The costs involved in managing the refugee outflows, their temporary or permanent resettlement and the spread of crime, infectious diseases and other maladies are just some examples that come to mind from the perspective of the international community. In addition to these, the host societies often have to grapple with a number of other difficulties, usually on shoestring budgets.

Post-conflict societies exhibit all the characteristics of weak societies, regardless of whether they have a weak or strong State. Their infrastructure is destroyed or damaged, they suffer from depopulation or overpopulation in certain regions, the people are needy, resources are scarce; human rights are not efficiently protected and painful memories are still fresh. Unfortunately, we know of these ills first-hand. Croatia is still grappling with some of them while trying to help others that are much worse off in the region. In this regard, we sincerely hope that we can all heed the call issued by the Secretary-General in his report "Renewing the United Nations: a programme for reform" (A/51/950). In that report the Secretary-General obliquely stated that successful peace-building

requires a mutually reinforcing political strategy and assistance programme, incorporating human rights considerations and humanitarian and development programmes. The importance to peace-building of the mutual reaffirmation of these two approaches cannot be overemphasized.

The post-war reconstruction and reconciliation in Croatia are processes that necessarily take time, but can be accelerated through international support. Many displaced persons and refugees have returned, even though the economic and social situation in war-affected areas remains difficult, with soaring unemployment rates. There is a significant shortage of capital for new investment, job creation and specific projects, in particular demining. Over a million mines are still scattered on Croatian soil. Therefore, the already invested political, human and financial resources of the international community in Croatia should be coupled with development assistance if the desired results are to be achieved. Investment in peace, followed by investment in development, is part of the same continuum.

The establishment of truth about a conflict and the punishment of perpetrators of conflict-related grave breaches of humanitarian law are other prerequisites for the re-establishment of peace and security. On the global level, the establishment of the International Criminal Court should serve to aid and expedite the healing and reconciliation process.

In closing, I would like to make a few observations and suggestions regarding a need for a shared comprehensive strategy for peace-building for the Security Council to ponder. First, I commend the Council for incorporating disarmament, demobilization and reintegration components in several past and ongoing peace operations. This is useful and should become a standard bracket in each applicable peacekeeping mandate, as early on as possible. Likewise, the provisions regarding refugees and displaced persons, demining and other stimuli for effective economic recovery, as well as provisions on strengthening the rule of law and democratic institutions, must be anticipated and mandated by the Council in a timely fashion. This of course rests upon three important pillars: cooperation of the post-conflict society, sustainable political will on the part of the international community and an adequate bureaucratic capacity of the United Nations in general and the Secretariat in particular.

The United Nations system has a proven record of cooperation in peace-building activities with intergovernmental regional organizations, as well as non-governmental organizations. This is certainly fertile ground for future expansion of cooperation, and the Security Council can play an important role in this effort. However, we must recognize that the United Nations Secretariat needs capacity to coordinate these efforts with its partners, as well as among its own agencies. In some areas of expertise the Secretariat lacks the minimum standing capacity. If we ask the Secretariat to anticipate and respond to peace-building needs in a well-orchestrated, timely and, therefore, efficient manner, we must provide it with the capacity to do so.

Besides its role as an advocate for and guarantor of peace-building implementation, the Council can actively reach out to other principal United Nations bodies. In this regard, the role of the Economic and Social Council complements that of the Security Council. Indeed, the Economic and Social Council, with its broad agenda concerning the eradication of poverty and economic and social development, remains best equipped both to identify in a timely manner and to act pre-emptively upon these very causes of new or recurrent conflicts.

Therefore, I see great value in a potential joint follow-up meeting of the two councils on this or related matters in the near future. We must make an effort to build closer ties in order to address the converging agendas of world peace and world development.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Croatia for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Nepal. I invite him to take a seat at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. Sharma (Nepal): I wish to begin by congratulating you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of February. Let me also thank you for selecting as a topic for open debate the theme of peace-building, a topical issue of fundamental significance for peace and security in the world. The paper you have circulated (S/2001/82, annex) is useful for organizing our thoughts.

Armies may sometimes win a battle, but humanity always loses the war. Humanity bleeds in victory and in defeat. Countless lives are lost and colossal wealth that could do tremendous good by making a difference in people's lives is destroyed. Children lose their fathers, wives their husbands and parents their sons. Ironically, conflict bedevils those who can least afford it. Each bullet that is fired burns up several children's hopes of buying textbooks. Every bomb that is blasted engulfs resources sufficient to build several schools and hospitals and to construct several miles of road.

Conflicts are inherently evil, for they bring unspeakable misery and pain, mostly to innocent women and children. But they, sadly, happen with remarkable frequency, now more within States than between States. We are all members of the same human family. Globalization has brought us closer together. Every war is now our war, not theirs.

Through the Charter, the community of nations entrusted the task of maintaining world peace to the United Nations, and particularly to the Security Council. It is the solemn treaty obligation — besides being a moral imperative — of members of the Security Council, as the collective guarantors of peace, to shoulder that responsibility. It is also the bounden duty of other States to collaborate with the Council.

We must do everything in our power, as nations and as people, to prevent war through the peaceful settlement of disputes and to save humanity from its scourge. But the Security Council has seldom been able to stave off the hostility that burns the bridges between people, making settlement more difficult, if not impossible. Failing that, the Security Council is left with only one costly, second-rate alternative: to manage conflict once it begins to exact its price. The complexity of this option is compounded when the Council has to grapple in tandem with peacekeeping, peace-building and peacemaking, each one quite involved in itself.

"An Agenda for Peace" (S/24111) and the report (S/2000/809) of the Panel on United Nations Peace Operations chaired by Mr. Lakhdar Brahimi both recognized peace-building as a powerful tool to sustain peace once it has been restored. But it is exceptionally complex to devise and to implement. The Brahimi report is indicative of the tangle involved. It contends that effective peace-building requires active engagement with the local parties, and that such engagement should be multidimensional in nature.

Building peace is a long and complicated process, not an isolated event; it has to be part of a larger nation-building process. It is all the more formidable because it has to be achieved when central authority may have broken down, when law and order are non-existent and when local institutions are dysfunctional. It means, in a way, beginning to convert the seemingly impossible into the possible in as short a span as possible, amidst the heightened animosity of conflict, by bringing clashing stakeholders together, by reasoning with them and convincing them to put their bitter past behind, and by moving them on towards a common high goal.

Since it touches all aspects of national life, peace-building must be comprehensive in content, participatory and inclusive in approach, and conciliatory in nature. But primarily, it is a complicated political process where jockeying for advantage, bargaining and hard compromises become fundamental rules of the game. Understanding has to be built where there is none. The entire society has to be brought on board by building confidence, so that no one feels left out or deceived, which would be a sure recipe for future tension.

Peace-building, therefore, is a fairly long commitment on the part of the United Nations and the international community, and it taxes their patience and resources considerably. To make it work, the Council must set a clear and achievable objective that can be realized in a span of three to five years and must chalk out a comprehensive plan accordingly.

Identifying a problem, it is said, is half the solution. Conflicts have been both causes and consequences of a number of social ailments. Poverty, for instance, is a time bomb ready to explode at the slightest provocation — and there are provocateurs aplenty: terrorists, drug barons, smugglers and thugs selling dreams to the poor and cajoling them into catastrophe. Ethnic, religious and cultural fault lines have long been understood as underpinning various upheavals. Colonial legacies and unscrupulous political elements have undermined peace in numerous situations.

One might wish that there were prototype solutions to intricate peace and security problems. But there are none. A peace-building plan needs to be

evolved, keeping in perspective the configuration of the actors and factors prevailing in each unique situation and dovetailing it with a larger framework of nation-building. Focus should be on reviving and strengthening endogenous institutions and processes rather than on supplanting them with exogenous ones. It is important quickly to build local capacity that can uphold and sustain peace against heavy odds and to enable external involvement to be gradually phased out.

Partnership, cooperation and coordination become essential to produce synergy and to optimize the impact of collective efforts. It is as critical among the key stakeholders in the State in conflict as it is between such a State and external actors or among external players. The easiest option is not necessarily the best. The Council must do what is right, not what is easy. This is a hard choice, but it is the defining virtue and ideal that the founding fathers contemplated for the United Nations.

The Council must overcome the natural temptation to choose the line of least resistance. Reconciliation, not divorce, ought to be our goal. Cambodia and Mozambique present an earnest, if still fragile, effort at conciliation. But most other peace-building missions, including those in East Timor and in the Balkans, have left a sour taste in one mouth or another. We must strive to heal the wound, not to amputate the limb at the first sign of trouble.

As the sovereign equality of States is the foundation of the United Nations, it becomes incumbent on each of us not to trivialize this fundamental premise. If there is a gulf between the segments of the population, we need to narrow it; if there are disagreements, we should seek to promote rapprochement. Unless people in a State themselves so decide, the United Nations must not engage in severing a part from the whole and undermining the sanctity and integrity of a State.

The reason for this is simple. Differences are bound to occur even in a State of ethnic or religious homogeneity, but they do not validate separation; rather, they offer the first lesson in tolerance and challenge us to foster unity in diversity.

A pattern of selective involvement in conflict situations has at times prompted many to question the objectivity and fairness of the Security Council in its operations. The Council must try to engage on the merit of each case, not on the basis of the political priorities of its members. It will have to begin with the Council's establishing general guidelines for the Secretariat to follow when recommending to the Council a specific course of action in a particular conflict situation. Only this standard-setting will enable the Secretariat to tell the Council what it needs to know, rather than what it wants to hear. This measure will tremendously enhance the international community's confidence in the Council and facilitate the work of the Secretariat.

Nepal has always maintained that, whenever the Security Council engages in activities that touch on the scope of other competent bodies and agencies, it must involve all relevant international agencies and regional mechanisms in the process. This will be in the interest of the Council itself in the long run, as it can liberally draw on the competence of other relevant bodies as well as carefully save itself from stretching itself too thin and rendering itself ineffective.

Conflict manifests a complex set of political, economic, social and cultural problems inherent in our societies. Therefore, there are no easy solutions to it. Peace-building ought to be an effort in the utmost sincerity as the first step to nation-building, not just to bring temporary relief that is unlikely to last. That will be a more effective, credible and less expensive way to promote peace in the service of all humanity. Time is of the essence in this context. As is said, a stitch in time saves nine. The Council will do well to change its habit of doing too little too late at an unconscionable cost.

Nepal appreciates the Council's good work in many situations and encourages the Council to stave off an advancing storm, rather than wait to clean up the mess after the fury has hit the ground. We have worked with the Council closely in the past and remain committed to doing so in a spirit of cooperation and common good.

The President (*spoke in Arabic*): I thank the representative of Nepal for his kind words addressed to me.

I shall now make a brief statement in my capacity as representative of Tunisia.

I shall not repeat the points addressed by earlier speakers, but I wish to start by stating that the experience of past years has shown the need of the

Organization to adjust its working methods in order to give the issue of peace-building its due priority, raising it high on the international community's agenda.

The close link between conflict prevention and peace-building points to the importance of maintaining peace and approaching it in all its aspects, as has been stressed in today's discussion. In our view, this approach must be anchored in a comprehensive and integrated strategy and must involve all partners. It must identify the questions of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration, poverty and marginalization, the establishment of law and order and the promotion of human rights as critical to peace-building.

When we discuss the role of the Security Council in peace-building, we must recall that the Council has adopted many resolutions promoting peace and has attached high priority to it as a means of addressing the root causes of conflict and tension, including poverty, suffering and all forms of deprivation arising from economic and social backwardness. It is these elements that cause violence and conflict.

I shall not repeat the statements of many speakers during the Millennium Summit and the resolution adopted last September by the Security Council on the need to develop a comprehensive and integrated strategy within the United Nations system to address all these root causes of conflict. I do wish to say, however, that these commitments, adopted at the highest international political level, represent the appropriate and optimum embodiment of the interlinkage between and integration of development, peace and stability.

The United Nations system is therefore called upon to develop the basic elements necessary to maintaining this partnership. This will require us to adopt a new approach to addressing conflict and tension. What is needed today from the international community is a qualitative leap in addressing the issue of peace-building. As I have indicated, it must do so by focusing effectively on the root causes of conflict, rather than on the symptoms. To that end, Tunisia feels that there must be a comprehensive approach predicated on three points.

First is the importance of developing innovative mechanisms commensurate with the problems of poverty and deprivation, along with the other inherent causes of conflict. Such mechanisms must be flexible and effective, providing an expeditious response to the established requirements of the most needy areas. In this regard, many initiatives have been proposed, particularly in the context of the General Assembly at its current session, to revive existing mechanisms and to consolidate integration among all bodies of the international community. In this context, I would cite the General Assembly's welcome, in its resolution on the implementation of the first United Nations Decade for the Eradication of Poverty, of the initiative to establish the World Solidarity Fund for Poverty Eradication.

The other point is that a comprehensive and integrated peace strategy must be developed to address all aspects of peace, including political, economic, social and humanitarian aspects. Such a strategy should be developed with the involvement of all international partners, and roles should be assigned to them, whether the United Nations, regional and subregional organizations or international financial institutions and of course the State concerned. The central responsibility should remain with the United Nations, given its unique stature and role in international relations. The strategy must be put into place within the context of respect for the mandate and responsibility of all United Nations organs.

The third and last point, given the organic and growing relationship between the maintenance of international peace and security and peace-building, is the fact that it has become essential that the Security Council give a push to the international community's efforts to consolidate peace, since the Council has a special responsibility is in this area. As we can see from today's discussions, the Council can perform this role through mobilization of the political will of the international community so that its resources, especially financial, can be mobilized to establish and promote peace in fulfilment of the provisions of the Charter on behalf of all peoples of the world.

I now resume my functions as President of the Council.

With the indulgence of Council members, at the end of this debate I would like to thank all delegations that participated in these important discussions for their valuable input and worthwhile ideas that underscore the importance and relevance of the issues under discussion.

Without being exhaustive, let me cite the following points. First is the need to develop a common approach between the United Nations and all participating actors in order to develop a practical, comprehensive and integrated strategy to promote peace, taking into account the primary responsibility of the State concerned. Second is the need to support the capabilities of the Secretary-General, especially as regards coordination of the agreed strategy. Third, we must take into account the necessity of this strategy focusing efficiently on the deep roots of conflicts, especially the economic and social roots, due to the close links between security, stability and development. Fourth, it need be considered that the elimination of poverty is a collective international responsibility and that an innovative approach and mechanism must be developed to address poverty and economic backwardness; flexibility is essential in order to respond expeditiously to the urgent needs of vulnerable groups. Fifth, there is a need to focus on sound governance, democracy and the building of State institutions as essential ingredients for promoting peace; also, the disarmament, demobilization and reintegration of former combatants, while paying special and adequate attention to children, refugees, internally displaced persons and the promotion of the role of women in peace-building. Sixth, there must be coordination among all active parties and apportionment of responsibilities in the area of peace-building, especially with the General Assembly and the Economic and Social Council.

In the seventh place, let us underscore the special importance of the Security Council in mobilizing international political will, given its special responsibility in the area of international peace and security and the close relationship between the maintenance of peace and security, conflict prevention and peace-building. Eighth is the need to start consultations among all active parties at an early stage, before establishing any peacekeeping mission, for better preparation and coordination towards that goal. Lastly, in the ninth place, there is a need to promote international partnership in all phases of conflict prevention and peace-building; this partnership should be sustainable and continuous.

There are no further speakers inscribed on my list. The next meeting of the Security Council to continue consideration of the item on the agenda will take place on Friday, 16 February 2001.

The meeting rose at 7 p.m.